

Jeremy the Tank Engine

Just how effective - and likewise destructive - the influence exerted by Shari leftism within the mainstream left can be was exemplified by the contest for the Labour Party leadership, which became vacant after the resignation of Ed Miliband following Labour's defeat in the General Election of May 2015. One of the candidates, initially seen as an outsider, was the far-leftist back-bench Labour MP for Islington North, Jeremy Corbyn. Corbyn was the classic fellow-traveller, or less politely if no less accurately, 'useful idiot', because he had travelled. not only with Jihadi Islam, but like many similar dupes who came before him, with Stalinism. What we know about his family background suggests that the latter may well have been an inheritance from his parents, who met while campaigning on purges, the Spanish Communist Party came to exert a disastrous predominance. Be that as it may, the way he tells it, they were 'both peace campaigners'. But then Corbyn had advocated a 'negotiated settlement' via a diplomatic 'back channel' with the Islamic State, so why not one between Franco's fascists and the Spanish republic?

As is the case with many occupations, an MP cannot choose all whom they associate with, whether at Westminster, in their local party, or among their constituents. Politics is a team game. But beyond that, an MP, especially one not encumbered by ministerial responsibilities, also has the opportunity, and some would say the duty, to seek out the company of those with whom they share similar convictions and interests both at Westminster, and the wider world. In the first category, there are numerous cross-party and party groupings an MP can belong to if they so wish. Examples of the former, which as of 2017 numbered 630, (only 30 less than the total number of MPs), were the Jazz Appreciation and Pancreatic Cancer groups, and of the latter, the Labour Friends of Israel and Labour Friends of Palestine. As membership of such groupings is purely voluntary, it cannot be therefore by either chance or necessity that while neither Corbyn nor any of his inner circle belonged to the Israeli grouping, they all belonged to the Palestinian. Outside of Parliament, an MP is likewise free to support, found, join, promote, sponsor and participate in any cause or campaign that takes their fancy, so long as organisations they join or form do not support or stand candidates at local or national level against their own party or engage in illegal activity. Here too the choices an MP makes, and therefore the company they keep as a result of them, will necessarily reflect their own convictions and priorities. It is these political relationships, freely entered into and enduring, that bear out the truth of the saying that one should judge someone by the company they keep. And of all UK politicians, that could not have been truer of anyone than Jeremy Corbyn who, although virtually unknown outside the Westminster village, in September 2015 was elected Leader of the Labour Party on the first ballot with 59% of the vote, 40% more than his closest contender.

From what was known of his political leanings before he became an MP, although a member of the Labour Party, Corbyn had not only been attracted to the Communist Party, but its staunchly pro-Moscow minority faction, the 'tankies', so described on account of their enthusiastic support for massive Red Army invasions of the Kremlin's brother communist states in Eastern Europe. From as

early as 1983, when he first became a Labour MP, he was already writing for the Communist Party's *Morning Star*, which had been captured by the tankies and used as a vehicle for their ultra-Stalinist policies. The official party dissolved in 1991, becoming the Democratic Left, three years after the tankies had split away to form their own Communist Party of Britain and made the *Morning Star* their daily paper, for which Corbyn later wrote a weekly column. Bear in mind that this party was one of a number of organisations proscribed by the Labour Party, since it stood candidates in elections also contested by Labour, meaning that members of it were barred from membership of the Labour Party. When the original party split, Corbyn went with the tankies, some might say a perverse choice for a peace campaigner, but then so were his associations with IRA terrorists, Jew-killing Jihadis, war criminal President Assad of Syria and his sympathies for President Putin of Russia and employment by the hanging and stoning Ayatollahs of Iran. He continued to write regularly for their paper until his election as Leader of the Labour Party in 2015. With regard to his Soviet sympathies, in 1987, Corbyn had at least three documented meetings with Czech Intelligence operative Jan Dymic, two of them in the House of Commons, at a time when Czechoslovakia was still under Soviet occupation after the Kremlin's tanks crushed Dubcek's bid to create a 'socialism with a human face' in 1968. Soviet occupation, good, Israeli occupation, bad.

Corbyn's profile was that of the classic fellow-traveller, or as Lenin put so aptly, 'useful idiot', even to the extent of retaining his loyalty to the Kremlin after the collapse of the USSR in 1991, as can be seen from his response in the *Morning Star* to Putin's onslaught on the Ukraine, denial of Kremlin 'special operations' in the UK, and refusal to protest Moscow's war crimes committed in support of the Assad regime in Syria. (Corbyn was a guest of President Assad in 2009.) Two factors were at play in moulding the thinking, for want of a better word, that guided Corbyn's attitude to the Putin regime. The seeds were sown in the pre-1991 era, when like all true fellow-travellers, Corbyn saw in the Soviet Union and by extension, its empire in Eastern Europe, both the socialist alternative to western capitalism and no less importantly, the counterweight to the military might of the US and its Nato and European Union allies.

With the demise of the USSR and the liberation of its former East European colonies, it was this second role played by the Kremlin which commanded Corbyn's support, together with Jihadi Islam, while leftist dictatorships in Cuba, Nicaragua, Bolivia and Venezuela performed the first. This was no side-line to his parliamentary responsibilities. As an always available useful idiot, he must surely hold the record for patronage, sponsorship and office-holding in fronts, bogus solidarity campaigns and operations that either seek to undermine the security of western liberal democracy, or at the very least, promote regimes and movements which reject its ethos, namely the Campaign for (unilateral) Nuclear Disarmament, the Islamophile Unite Against Fascism, the Stop the War Coalition, and Cuba, Nicaragua, Venezuela and Palestine (for which read his 'friends' Hamas and Hezbollah) Solidarity. The prototype for this species of bogus solidarity, which in reality serves purely as a propaganda mouthpiece for the regime in question, not the people it rules over, was the network of lavishly-funded 'Friendship Societies' with the USSR and its East European colonies established in the UK and other western countries after the Second World War by the Kremlin and, more recently, the 'twinning' industry, with its VIP junkets and Potemkin tourism for the gullible and

the corruptible. Corbyn's support for the Kremlin's post-Soviet expansionist foreign policy is neatly encapsulated in an article with the Orwellian title 'NATO [sic!] Belligerence Endangers Us All', published in the *Morning Star* of April 17, 2014, only a matter days after Putin had completed the illegal annexation of Crimea and invasion of Ukraine's Donbas region. What we have here is an exposition of Corbynista armchair geo-politics, a *tour d'horizon* which smugly charts what he believes is the terminal decline and fall of the West, and the rise of a 'resurgent' East:

...while the endless drama of meetings, lurid statements and predictions and mass demonstrations catches [should be 'catch']...so much for prep school] the world's eye, something more significant and fundamental is taking place. As the US moves into relative economic decline, China's expansion and Russia's huge energy reserves and location are moving the politics of the world into a different place...The broad historical sweep since the end of the Soviet Union showed two decades of unipolar US power. But now the resurgence of Russia [sic] and the enormous [capitalist] economic power of China are ending that.

Corbyn then gets down to specifics, first, the consequences of the dominance of the USA resulting from the demise of that bastion of peace and socialism, the Kremlin empire: 'The history of conflicts since 1990 is grim.' And each one is, as always, the fault of the West: 'Hot wars took place in the Gulf, the former Yugoslavia, in Afghanistan, Iraq and Libya, all involving the US and NATO', with in every case, Corbyn backing the other side. Not a word about the Kremlin's carnage of Muslims in Chechnya, the 'ethnic cleansing' of Muslims by Russian-backed Serbs in the former state of Yugoslavia, which Corbyn denied in a motion moved in the House of Commons, or the despotic nature of the regimes deposed in each case, whose fate he so obviously regretted... that of indicted war criminal Milosevic in Serbia, the Taliban theocracy in Afghanistan, the fascist regime of Saddam with its invasion of Kuwait and genocide of the Kurds, and the corrupt tyranny of Gaddafi, overthrown not by NATO but his own people. In May 2017, when asked to name a military action by the UK since the Second World War he could describe as just, Corbyn was unable to do so. The converse necessarily followed that all those regimes whom the UK fought against unjustly *were* waging a just war...Saddam, the Argentinian junta, Milosevic, the Taliban, the Islamic State. Given his anti-Western stance in these conflicts, after being elected Labour Leader, Corbyn quite logically therefore refused to commit himself to Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, which obliges all members of NATO to come to each other's assistance if attacked by a third party. The article had only been invoked once, by the USA after the terrorist attacks of 9/11, which, along with a galaxy of conspiracy theorists, Corbyn claimed had been 'manipulated' to justify the US attack on the Taliban. Corbyn's refusal to honour Article 5 must have been music to the ears of Assad, Putin and Kim Jong-un, or any other totalitarian thug who intended to throw his weight about. But NATO was not the only villain of the piece. The European Union had also become a 'tool of US policy', which in its turn, as he had claimed in article in the *Morning Star* dating from 2011, was controlled by Israel, or as his Syrian host, the war criminal President Assad explained it to him, Israel was 'the tail that wags the US dog'. It therefore followed logically, in accordance with Jewish conspiracy theory, that

by using the USA as its proxy, Israel was also in effective control of not only NATO, but the European Union. What better reason then, when the opportunity came in the referendum of June 2016, to leave it?

Corbyn's track record on Europe, beginning with his voting to leave in the referendum of 1975, had been one of consistent opposition to the UK's membership of the European Union and its predecessors, invariably voting in the Commons against every measure that brought the UK into a closer relationship with its continental partners. As her master's voice, Diane Abbott, put it, 'in Jeremy's heart of hearts, he's a Brexiteer.' At a meeting in 2009, he denounced the EU as a 'European empire of the 21st century', one 'subservient to the wishes of NATO', for which read the USA, a 'massive great military Frankenstein', 'which will so be damaging to all of us.' He expressed the hope that a referendum would be an opportunity for the UK to leave the EU. In 2016, his wish, and the result he sought, came, courtesy of Tory Prime Minister Cameron and UKIP. Understandably then, Corbyn's Communist Party comrades had every reason to expect him to continue his opposition to the EU once he was elected Labour Leader in September 2015. In a statement celebrating his victory, the party claimed that 'the forthcoming EU referendum will provide a huge opportunity [all opportunities are 'huge] for the labour movement to inflict a massive defeat [all defeats are 'massive] on the Tory Government, its City paymasters and the EU by campaigning against EU membership.' Corbyn, it was hoped, and indeed expected, would lead this campaign for Brexit, an assumption based squarely on what the party knew to be his stance on this issue, one that he had made perfectly clear in the cited *Morning Star* article and his voting record in Parliament. The problem for Corbyn was that he had been elected Leader of a party that from being initially largely Eurosceptic, had over the decades become increasingly pro EU. After running what his Labour critics described as at best a 'lukewarm' campaign to remain, (some accused him of sabotaging it, even taking a holiday when he should have been on the stump) within hours of the announcement of the result, Corbyn was the first party leader to call for the activation of Article 50 that triggered the process of leaving, followed, contrary to the policy of his party, by his rejection of calls for a second referendum on the final deal.

As a self-styled peace campaigner, foreign policy had always been Corbyn's main concern. What he had to say about the conflict between the Ukraine and the Kremlin therefore must surely have gladdened the hearts of the *Morning Star*'s Russophile readers. On March 18, 2014, only a month before Corbyn wrote the above quoted article, Russia had illegally annexed the Crimea, and used military force to create two puppet states in the Donbas, both actions being violations of international law that met with only token sanctions by western states dependent on Russian energy, and none at all from the United Nations. While Corbyn was careful to say that he 'would [sic, not 'do'] not condone Russian behaviour or expansion', that is exactly what he did do, because then he added that 'it was not unprovoked', so the prime responsibility lay with whoever did the 'provoking', allegedly NATO and its Ukrainian puppets. This was also the opinion of his future 'spin doctor' Seumas Milne, who in the *Guardian* of March 5, 2014, insisted that 'Putin's absorption [sic] of the Crimea and support for the rebellion [sic] in Eastern Ukraine is clearly defensive'...just like the Kremlin's invasion of Poland, Finland and the Baltic states at the time of Stalin's pact with Hitler, and Hungary by Khrushchev and Czechoslovakia and Afghanistan by Brezhnev.

Corbyn was well known for his opposition to what he regarded as the illegal occupation of the West Bank by Israel. But when the invaders, occupiers - *and annexers*- were Russians and not Jews, much changed. It is the west that is the guilty party, not Putin: ‘The expansion of Nato into Poland and the Czech Republic has particularly increased tensions with Russia.’ This ‘expansion into’ was not, as Corbyn implies by the use of this term, imposed on the countries concerned, but was the result of a request for membership of NATO by the democratically-elected governments of Poland and Czechoslovakia, nations which had long and bitter memories of uninvited ‘expansions’ coming from the opposite direction, and sought protection from what Corbyn described euphemistically but also approvingly as a ‘resurgent Russia’. Corbyn in fact seemed to be saying that unlike any western country or alliance, Russia had the right of veto over the foreign policies of countries close to or bordering on its territory, what is known in diplomatic language redolent of the Stalin-Hitler Pact of August 23, 1939 and the post-Second World Potsdam agreements between the USSR, Britain and the USA, as a ‘sphere of interest’. While NATO was condemned for ‘acting outside its own area’, Corbyn clearly believed Russia did have legitimate concerns beyond its own borders and even, it seems, if provoked, could extend these borders without any serious protest from the veteran anti-imperialist peace campaigner. While there were what Corbyn called ‘huge questions about the West’s interests in the Ukraine,’ he had nothing to say about those of Putin in the same country, even though he had only just invaded and annexed vast slices of its territory. And ‘huge’ though these questions were, readers learned nothing about their nature, or their presumably no less huge answers. Instead, they were bombarded with Stalinist vintage denunciations of the USA: ‘The overall issue [sic] is still one of the activities and expansionism of the post 1990 United States...The obsession with Cold War politics that exercises the NATO and EU leadership [there we have it again] is fuelling the crisis and underlines the case for a whole [sic] new approach to foreign policy.’

And once Corbyn became Labour Leader, ‘new approach’ it most certainly was. Such loyalty to the Kremlin cause surely deserved its reward, and it duly came even before Corbyn was elected Leader of the Labour Party in September 2015. Putin supporter Fyodor Lukyanov, Editor of the journal *Russia in Global Affairs*, said ‘Russia would certainly be pleased to see such a person at the head of either major party’. For once, the Kremlin spoke the truth. When challenged for the leadership by Owen Smith a year later, on July 9, Corbyn received the endorsement of the *Morning Star* in article by the veteran ‘tankie’ and Stalin apologist Andrew Murray, who had taken turns with Corbyn as chair of the Stop the (western) War Coalition, and was soon to become Corbyn’s most trusted political adviser. Titled ‘Corbyn is the best chance in a generation to break with Britain’s blood-soaked militarism’ (never mind about the Kremlin’s), the article was devoted entirely to foreign policy issues, the common ground that had always been shared by the anti-Western Corbyn and the Muscovite Stalinists of the Communist Part of Britain..

One good turn deserved another. In the run-up to the General Election of June 2017, Corbyn appointed the Stalinist Murray to head his election strategy team, Murray having previously resigned, officially at least, from the Communist Party, and then joined the Labour Party to facilitate the appointment. Asked why he had chosen a notorious Stalinist and 40-year member of the Communist Party for such

a crucial role in the election, all Corbyn could say was that Murray was a ‘democratic socialist’ and was a member of the Labour Party. The first was a blatant lie, while second was true but proved nothing as regards his politics. Trotskyist ‘entrists’, and Stalinist fellow-travellers like indeed Corbyn himself, have passed themselves off as loyal democratic socialists for decades, while from the far right, there is the case of a young Muslim woman who before being elected as a Labour councillor in Luton, had advertised her admiration for ‘my man Hitler’ on the internet. And she was only one of hundreds, possibly even thousands, who were able to reconcile their membership of the Labour Party with a similar hatred of the Jews. As for Murray’s ‘democracy’, could perhaps Corbyn have had in mind the version practised by the ‘German Democratic Republic’, whose demise in 1989 was mourned by Murray as ‘a historic setback for human progress’, and in happier times, whose delights were savoured by Corbyn when he toured the Kremlin’s bewalled colony on his motorbike with, so it is said, Diane Abbott riding pillion, or that of the ‘People’s Democratic Republic of Korea’, which Murray declared his solidarity with as a leading member of the Communist Party? Be all that as it may, Murray’s not so ex party announced that it would not, as in all previous contests, be running any candidates against the Corbynised Labour Party in the forthcoming General Election.

Just like Galloway and Livingstone, who both endorsed Corbyn’s leadership bid, from the first days of the anti-Zionist left as an organised movement, Corbyn’s interest in Middle Eastern affairs had led him to form associations with individuals, pressure groups, campaigns and internationally, regimes and movements that were anything but left wing. This was because Corbyn’s rise to prominence in the anti-Zionist movement coincided with the emergence of theocratic jihadism in the Middle East, a development that required an accommodation with their increasingly more active Muslim offshoots in the UK. Corbyn’s rise to prominence in the anti-Zionist began when he was elected as a Labour MP for Islington North in 1983. He then teamed up with two other anti-Zionist Labourites who were at that time closely associated with Gerry Healy’s Gaddafi-funded Workers Revolutionary Party, GLC Leader Ken Livingstone, and WRP veteran Ted Knight whom I knew personally when, back in the 1960s, we were both leading members of the WRP’s forerunner, the Socialist Labour League. From 1983 to 1986, Knight, then Leader of Lambeth Council, together with Livingstone, whom Corbyn chose as his defence adviser when elected Labour Leader in 2015, and John McDonnell, Corbyn’s Shadow Chancellor of the Exchequer, edited *Labour Herald*, a Ghaddafi - financed weekly publication printed on the WRP’s printing press, Astmoor Litho. *Labour Herald*, like the WRP’s daily *Newsline*, regularly carried features attacking Israel, one being a review of three books which alleged that the Zionist movement had collaborated with the Nazis, colluding in the Holocaust to gain sympathy for a Jewish state in Palestine. Israel, claimed the reviewer, Harry Mullin, ‘is a state built on the blood of Europe’s Jews, whom the Zionists deserted in their hour of greatest need’. Over time, as we have seen, this became the standard left-wing version of Holocaust revisionism. A year later came the publication of another revisionist work, Lenni Brenner’s *Zionism in the Age of Dictators*, the book which served as the source of Livingstone’s oft-repeated claim that Hitler ‘supported Zionism’. Not long after writing his review, Mullin found a new outlet for his anti-Semitism by making a natural progression from the insidious Jew-baiting of *Labour Herald* to

the uninhibited version promoted by the Neo-Nazi British National Party, where he was free to promote the orthodox Holocaust revisionist version that it never happened.

It was at this time, in 1983, the year when, without severing his close association with the Communist Party's tankies, he was first elected as a Labour MP, that Corbyn made his debut as a prominent anti-Zionist activist, helping to found, and then becoming a sponsor, together with Livingstone, of the Labour Movement Campaign for Palestine (later, the Palestine Solidarity Campaign), the two aims of which were to make the case for the replacement of Israel by a secular Palestinian state and to combat 'manifestations of Zionism' (sic) in the Labour Party. To this end, he was one of a number of far-left sponsors (Corbyn had always been one for sponsoring anything which smacked of anti-Zionism) of a motion adopted at a meeting on May, 19, 1984, which launched a campaign to 'disaffiliate Poale Zion [now the Jewish Labour Movement] from the Labour Party', of which it had been a part since 1920. The same resolution also initiated a related 'campaign to break all links with [the Israel trade union movement] Histadrut', demanding that 'the Trades Union Congress and its affiliate unions' should 'reconsider the nature of Histadrut and their links with this body'. In both cases, the 'nature' at issue was that both organisations were Jewish, though in the case of Histadrut, it also enrolled Arab members.

When later confronted with the rise in the Middle East of decidedly non-secular Islamic jihadism, as represented by such movements as Islamic Jihad, Hezbollah, the Muslim Brotherhood and its Hamas offshoot, Corbyn and Livingstone made the necessary theological adjustments. With Allah now in the driving seat, there was no more talk of a 'secular Palestinian state', code for one ruled by Arafat's quasi-secular PLO. With a perfect sense of timing, only six months before the attack on the World Trade Centre, Corbyn voted in Parliament against a bill banning Al-Qaeda, the movement that carried out the atrocity, along with a number of other overtly Islamic terrorist organisations including Hamas and Hezbollah, both of which were then and are now committed to the destruction of Israel and the extermination of world Jewry, and which Corbyn has described as his 'friends'. Corbyn was one of 17 Labour MPs who voted against the measure, together with two future members of his shadow cabinet, Diane Abbott and John McDonnell. And as one would expect, it was Islam in its various manifestations which also served as the prime focus for Corbyn's extra-Parliamentary activities. In view of his friendship with and praise for Hamas, one must ask the question, had Corbyn taken the trouble to read the 1988 Hamas Covenant, with its unambiguous call for the elimination of the state of Israel and the genocide of all the Jews on the planet, and, also emulating Hitler, its citation of the *Protocols* as proof of a world Zionist conspiracy?

Ten days after 9/11, in anticipation of a US-led military operation to remove the Taliban from power in Afghanistan, Corbyn helped to found and then chaired the Stop the War Coalition, which then in 2003 organised opposition to a similar military campaign to remove the genocidal Saddam regime in Iraq. In the same year, writing in the *Morning Star*, Corbyn endorsed the allegation of conspiracy theorists that 9/11 had been 'manipulated': 'After September 11, the claims that bin Laden and al-Qaeda had made the atrocity were quickly and loudly made. This was turned into an attack on the Taliban and then, subtly, into regime change in Afghanistan.' Corbyn obviously wanted the murderous Taliban theocracy to

remain in power. But his statement also begged the question...if it wasn't bin Laden, who was it? Another of Corbyn's anti-Semitic 'friends', the Hamas Preacher Sheikh Raed Salah, believed he had the answer: 'A suitable way was found to warn the 4,000 [sic] Jews who work in the Twin Towers to absent themselves from their work on September 11.'

With Corbyn acting as the link, the Coalition was the product of a coming together of two hitherto antagonistic branches of Bolshevism; Trotskyism as represented (rather badly I would submit) by the Socialist Workers Party, which refused to condemn the al-Qaeda attack on the World Trade Centre, and Stalinism, by Communist Party veteran and first Coalition Chairman Andrew Murray, and also by Vice-President Kamil Majid, also founder no less of the British Stalin Society. But the Islamic interest was also present and well-catered from the very beginning. In April 2002, Corbyn, along with Saddam stooge George Galloway and Tony Benn, addressed an anti-Zionist rally in Trafalgar Square convened by the British arm of the theocratic Muslim Brotherhood affiliate, the Muslim Association of Britain.

With his patronage and frequent appearances on the platform at rallies of the Palestine Solidarity Campaign, no one could doubt Corbyn's commitment to the Jihadi cause. And on February 12, 2006, we find him again addressing a Trafalgar Square rally, this time called by the Muslim Council of Britain and supported from the anti-Zionist Sharia left by London Mayor Ken Livingstone and the Socialist Workers Party, and from heaven by a number of Christian groups, to protest against cartoons published by the Danish newspaper *Jyllands-Posten* on September 30, 2005. Corbyn's presence at the meeting could only have meant that like the rest of the 5,000 protesters in attendance, he was opposed to a free press, especially when that freedom allowed criticism and satirisation of religion (and even more so, one suspects, when that religion was Islam). How else interpret his declaration to the meeting that 'we demand that people show respect for each other's community, each other's faith and [sic?] each other's religion'. The reader will have already learned just how much 'respect' Islam has for the followers of all other faiths, not to speak of those with none. As for Corbyn's injunction, when enunciating a categorical precept such as this, it is not unreasonable to expect that those doing so should set an example by always obeying it themselves.

Yet this is exactly what Corbyn on one well-advertised occasion lamentably failed to do. Not being a Catholic, in September 2017, he was taken to task by Clare Bowskill of the Latin Mass Society for receiving Holy Communion in a Catholic church: 'Most Catholics would consider that was disrespecting the faith quite considerably.' Yet he had said, this was a respect 'we demand'. The on-line *Oxford Dictionary* defines 'demand' as an 'insistent and peremptory request made as of right'. (My emphasis) By what right? Certainly not the intrinsic natural rights of man invoked by the Enlightenment, one of which, arguably the most fundamental, was freedom of thought and expression. And no less to the point, in whose name? Who precisely was this 'we', outside of the 5,000 or so attending the meeting'? In Islamic countries, clerics do indeed have the right to demand a great deal of those who come under their sway, especially when it comes to showing respect for Islam. In no fewer than twelve Islamic states (in addition to the one that with good reason, whatever Islamophiles say to the contrary, went by that name) apostasy is punishable by death, and blasphemy in ten, as Sharia law requires in both cases. And in the infidel world, terrorism is used against those

who fail to comply with its dictates, as in the *fatwa* death sentence on Salman Rushdie, and the murder of the staff of *Charlie Hebdo* and Theo van Gogh, the maker of film *Fitnah* (submission) about the oppression women under Islam. But as an MP, Corbyn surely knew that in the UK, the only institutions that have the legal right to 'demand' anything of anyone as of right are those so empowered by an Act of Parliament. What Corbyn was therefore 'demanding' were state-imposed restrictions on what anyone could say in public about religion in general and, we can be sure, Islam in particular. However, since Christianity was then still protected by the Blasphemy Laws (they were repealed, though only in England and Wales, despite concerted opposition by the clerical establishment, in 2008) Corbyn's demand for 'respect' for all religions was a cloak for the concerted drive by Muslim pressure groups to legally silence all criticism of just one - Islam. (This policy was taken up by Labour leader Ed Miliband in the course of his campaign for the General Election of May 2015, when he promised in an interview with the editor of a Muslim journal that if elected, he would introduce sweeping new laws to criminalise an undefined 'Islamophobia'. (See Chapter 28)

'Showing respect' so far as Islam goes is strictly a one-war street, and as we have already seen, the direst punishments can befall those do not share it. Corbyn's demagogic demand for 'respect' for religion has an intriguing provenance, one that had they known of it, might have appealed to some among his largely Muslim audience. On October 4, 1933, in order to placate the leaders of Germany's Catholic and Protestant Churches who, with few honourable exceptions, were broadly in agreement with many of Hitler's policies, the Nazi regime included in its press law of that date a provision that obliged newspapers to publish nothing that might 'injure the religious sensibilities of others'. Had this Nazi law been in force in Denmark in September 2005, there would have been no need for a Trafalgar Square protest on February 12, 2006.

Quite aside from its dubious, to say the least, precedent, Corbyn's demand for a curb on what can be said about religion was shot through with internal contradictions and false assumptions. Firstly, we have a self-styled quasi-Marxist who was evidently, judging by his comments on the subject, either totally unaware of or fundamentally disagreed with Marx's famous but now in far-leftist circles *verboten* dictum that 'the criticism of religion', which he described as 'the opium of the people', is 'the pre-requisite of all criticism'. Secondly, what did Corbyn mean by 'each other's religion'? Millions of people in the UK have no religion, so as far as they are concerned, there is no 'each other's'. With a 2019 survey suggesting that 53% of the UK population has no religious belief whatsoever (confirmed by the 2021 census), how could Corbyn (like Hilary Clinton) make the assumption that everyone has a religion that needs respecting? Could it have been because he spent so much of his time in the company of devout Muslims? But more to the point, by what right can it be 'demanded' of people that they show respect for something they do not respect?

If his 'demand' were to have had acquired the force of law, (if not, why the rally?) it would have resulted in a state-imposed conformism hitherto the monopoly of totalitarian and theocratic regimes of the kind admired by Corbyn, as in the cases of Cuba and Iran. And why only respect for faiths? If respect can be demanded for religious beliefs, why not for political doctrines, for example Nazism or Stalinism? Why the 'privileging' of the religious over the secular? And finally, how did Corbyn intend to ensure that his 'demand' would be made

effective? One can ban publications that do not show the respect for religion required of them, that is true, and that seems to be what he and his Muslim and SWP friends desired, for why else protest at the publication and recycling of the Danish cartoons? But outlawing manifestations of disrespect does not generate respect. Quite the contrary in fact, as the surge in sales for banned books has proven time and again. But for all that, by siding so openly with the demand for a Muslim respect police, Corbyn had shown where his sympathies and priorities lay so far as freedom of expression was concerned. In the wake of the *Charlie Hebdo* massacre, on February 12, 2015, he spoke at public meeting in London called by the Stop the War Coalition to protest, not against a terrorist atrocity that murdered journalists for exercising their right to satirise a religion, but ‘Islamophobia and the War on Terror’.

What of Corbyn’s partner of three decades and more in matters Sharia, the anti-Semitic Holocaust revisionist and then disgraced Ken Livingstone? Running as an independent, in 2000 he became the first elected mayor of London. and in that capacity, in 2004 played host at City Hall to a press conference sponsored by the Muslim Association of Britain. Its purpose was to provide a platform for the Muslim Brotherhood scholar Sheikh Yusef al-Qaradawi, who had been criticised for his support for Hamas suicide bombings of Israeli civilians. Introduced by Livingstone as his ‘honoured guest’, when challenged by journalists to justify the indiscriminate murder of Jewish civilians by those Corbyn would in 2009 describe as his ‘friends’, Qaradawi’s interpreter did not fully translate his reply from the Arabic. What he left out was Qaradawi’s explanation for why he did not regard Israeli women as civilians. ‘Their women are not like our women’, because Israeli women serve in the Israeli army, and were therefore fair game. Islamic clerics like Qaradawi did not have a monopoly on support for suicide bombing. In 2001, (the seminal year for the rise of the Sharia left) the once-Marxist *New Left Review* carried an article which described the tactic as ‘the ultimate weapon of the weak against the powerful of this earth’...like Jewish school children on a bus.

MPs reconciled to or, as Corbyn certainly did, revelling in a life-time on the backbenches, can engage in all manner of activities and say things which attract little if any media scrutiny, and concern the public even less, unless it happens to be their own MP. Such was Corbyn’s comment, one of many in the same genre, when, following the killing of the architect of 9/11, Bin Laden, by US special forces, Corbyn appeared on Iranian Press TV to deplore his death as a ‘tragedy’. At the time, he could never have anticipated that once thrust into the limelight by his totally unexpected emergence as the front runner in Labour’s leadership contest, these and other similar indiscretions would come back to haunt him. However, this did not dent his core support in the election, at least half of which, a survey revealed, like Corbyn identified the USA, and not Jihadi Islam or Putin’s Russia as the main threat to world peace. Other surveys at that time had shown that it was a different matter with the majority of Labour voters, and even more so with the public as a whole.

As a back-bench MP from 1983, Corbyn was able to find the time over the following years to hire himself out as a useful idiot to a number of terrorist movements, including not only those dedicated to the destruction of Israel but to British rule in Northern Ireland, in this respect as in several others emulating his long-time friend and comrade and fellow anti-Semite Ken Livingstone, and Sharia Labour and later Respect MP George Galloway. Post 9/11, and with the

Irish question no longer a burning issue, Corbyn focused his attention and time on the public promotion of all manner of Islamic causes, and in doing so, drew close to two anti-Semitic terrorist movements, Hamas and Hezbollah. In 2012, he spoke at a Ramadan celebration together with the Salafist convert preacher Abdur Raheem Green, who had publicly accused Jews of giving off a 'Yehudi stench' and advocated, as indeed all Muslim preachers should, the beating of wives to 'bring them to goodness', and of course the killing of gays and adulterers. Strange company for a man of the left.

Again, like fellow Sharia leftists Livingstone and Galloway, Corbyn had been paid for appearing on Iranian Press TV, endorsing a boycott of Israel on behalf of a regime that puts into practice what Green preached. In March 2009, Corbyn announced to an 'anti-war' rally that he had invited to a Parliamentary event the next day representatives of Hamas and Hezbollah, both being well-armed Jihadi organisations that made no secret of their goal of destroying Israel and exterminating all the Jews. It was then, justifying his invitation, that Corbyn described the representatives of the two genocidal movements as 'friends' who were 'dedicated to the good of the Palestinian people and bringing about long-term peace and social and political justice'. It was, he said, both a 'pleasure and honour' to be host to such guests. Labelling such movements as Hamas and Hezbollah as terrorist was 'a big, big, historical mistake'. Either Corbyn had indeed never take the trouble to read the Hamas Covenant, which is the total negation of the goals he ascribes to its authors, or he had, and for tactical reasons he chose to dissemble about its ultra-reactionary theocratic principles, objectives and terrorist methods. Or just maybe, useful idiot that was, he really did believe that Hamas was what he called it, a movement working for 'long-term peace [once that is Israel had been eliminated and all its Jews killed] and social and political justice'. Speaking on the same platform with Corbyn at the March 2009 rally was the Lebanese Muslim, Dyab Abou Jahjah. Abou Jahjah had never disguised his advocacy of Jihad against the west, telling a Flemish magazine that he considered 'every dead American, British and Dutch soldier a victory', presumably for Islam. His views on Israel were no less forthright, with his support for what he called a 'one-state solution'. Rightly or wrongly, his stances on Israel and terrorism led to him being banned from the UK in 2009. When asked by a BBC interviewer whether he had any recollection of meeting Abou Jahjah, Corbyn initially claimed that he had no idea who he was. Confronted with irrefutable proof to the contrary, namely a photograph of himself sitting on the platform next to Abou Jahjah at their Westminster event, Corbyn's lame excuse was that he 'met thousands of people'. Possibly...but with how many of them did he share a speaker's platform at two anti-Israel events on successive days?

Nor was this all, Far from it. Despite supposedly not knowing him, and yet obviously fully appraised of Abou Jahjah's controversial views, Corbyn went to some considerable lengths to ensure that he would able to speak at the two scheduled events, lobbying Labour's Home Secretary, Jacqui Smith, to as he put it, 'use government influence' to secure clearance for his guest to enter the country. But all Corbyn could say when asked if he knew his Lebanese Jihadi guest, was, 'Sorry...who? who is he?' (The same Home Office Minister who waved through Corbyn's terrorist guest had earlier that same year denied entry to Dutch MP Geert Wilders, who at the request of a House of Lords peer, had been invited to the UK to show his film *Fitna* highlighting the Jihadist message of Islam promoted by

Corbyn's guest.) It seems Abou Jahjah was none too pleased with Corbyn's vain attempt to disown him, commenting acidly on Twitter that 'whatever reasons made Mr [sic] Corbyn say this are for him to know and for us to guess.' That they shared a platform was 'beyond any doubt and is documented' and what is more, 'resulted in my ban to enter the UK', adding sarcastically, 'maybe he forgot about it. Who knows?' Whatever Abou Jahjah said at the meetings to get himself banned, it must have been pretty strong meat, even by Sharia left standards. Strange that Corbyn had no recollection of it. But it was not just two encounters at two meetings. Abou Jahjah insisted that 'we had, I think two times, lunch or breakfast together.' While he could not say Corbyn was 'a personal friend', he was 'absolutely a political friend'. But 'Mr Corbyn' had never heard of him! So it was either a case of a highly selective memory or a barefaced lie.

Corbyn had always justified the associations he did remember or admit to as being for the 'the good of the Palestinian people'. This of course depended on how one in this context defines what is meant by 'good'. What 'good' had the goal of eliminating Israel and killing its entire Jewish population, objectives of his 'friends' Hamas and Hezbollah that Corbyn must surely be aware of, brought to the Palestinians? That his guests excluded as matter of principle a negotiated two-state solution to the Palestinian question, and remain dedicated to completing the Nazis' 'final solution of the Jewish question', obviously did not trouble him in the least. Strange company for a man of the left. In 2011, Corbyn again played Parliamentary host, this time to the Muslim preacher and Hamas founder Raed Salah. One of Salah's claims to fame was being among the first to put into circulation the *canard* that all the World Trade Centre's Jewish employees (whom he numbered at 4,000!) stayed at home on the morning of 9/11. Another was repeating yet again the ancient Christian myth that the children of Europe had their 'blood mixed with the dough of the Jewish holy bread'. Comments such as this also had him banned from visiting the UK. That made two for Corbyn. He did pick them. True jihadi that he was, in 2011, Salah entered the UK illegally to spread his message of hate against the Jews and the West, only to be arrested and ordered to be deported on the grounds of his anti-Semitism.

Like the sayings and doings of his other anti-Semitic friends and associates, none of this seemed to have remotely troubled Corbyn or those who twice voted for him to become the leader of the Labour Party. His supporters insisted that although possibly having associates who were anti-Semitic, he was himself definitely not one, the proof being that he said so. Indeed, I have been personally assured by one of his many star-struck admirers that this is indeed the case. Be that as it may, in 2012, Corbyn was seen on Al Jazeera TV not only praising this same pathological anti-Semite as a 'very honoured citizen' who 'represents his people very well', possessing 'a voice that must be heard', but also, despite the ban, inviting him back to the UK! 'I hereby renew [sic] my invitation to Sheikh Salah to come to Parliament, to meet with me, meet with my colleagues. He will be assured of a very warm welcome. I look forward to giving you tea on the [House of Commons] terrace because you deserve it.' Had Corbyn succeeded in smuggling the banned hate preacher once more into the UK, Salah could have entertained Corbyn and his fellow tea drinkers on the House of Commons terrace by describing once again how Jews mix the blood of murdered Christian children with their Passover unleaven bread, and by repeating what he wrote after 9/11 in article for *Sawt al-Haq W'al-Huriyya*, the journal of Islamic Movement:

A suitable way was found to warn the 4,000 Jews who work every day in the Twin Towers to absent from their work on September 11, 2001, and this is what really happened. Were 4,000 Jewish clerks absent by chance, or was there another reason? At the same time, no such warning reached the 2,000 [sic!] Muslims who worked every day in the Twin Towers, and therefore there were hundreds of Muslim victims.

Just as Corbyn said, certainly ‘a voice that must be heard’. And, moreover, one that shared Corbyn’s conviction that 9/11 was ‘manipulated’. Next we have yet another anti-Semitic Corbyn associate, Paul Eisen, a fanatical anti-Zionist and cohort of the ubiquitous Holocaust-denier, anti-Zionist, Hitler (and Corbyn) admirer and former KKK Grand Wizard David Duke. Eisen’s friendship with Corbyn went back some fifteen years, and had evidently not been disturbed by Eisen’s Nazi connections and public repudiation of the Holocaust: ‘I question whether there ever existed homicidal gas chambers...For my money, a child of six can see that something’s not right about the Holocaust narrative. For me, “Holocaust Denier” is a label I accept.’ He also accepted Corbyn’s money. He recalled how, at their first encounter, Corbyn’s chequebook ‘was already on the table’ to contribute to Eisen’s ‘Deir Yassin Remembered’, an anti-Zionist group so extreme in its anti-Semitism that it was publicly disowned even by the Sharia leftist Palestinian Solidarity Campaign in 2007. But not by PSC founder and Patron Corbyn, who stood by his (anti-Semitic) man, and continued as before to attend annual meetings of his anti-Zionist society. A friend indeed: ‘During the time, I was marginalised, when the movement with which he was associated [the PSC] so despised me, Jeremy always said hello’. So Corbyn went behind the back of his own movement to continue befriending an anti-Semite who had been officially ostracised by it. Strange loyalty for someone the *Morning Star* described as having a ‘long and honourable record of opposing fascism, racism and anti-Semitism’.

Corbyn again found himself in such company when, in his capacity as the Stop the War Coalition’s useful idiot Chairman, on August 17, he addressed the 2012 London annual Iran-sponsored ‘al-Quds Day’ anti-Israeli rally. Displayed on the platform behind Corbyn could be clearly seen a large black Hezbollah banner dedicated to Ayatollah Khomeini, the founder of Iran’s Islamic Republic, under whose ten years of clerical despotism thousands of leftists, secular democrats and Kurdish separatists were tortured and butchered, and the *fatwah* against Salman Rushdie promulgated. His revered successor, Ayatollah Khamenei was, like so many of Corbyn’s associates, an avowed anti-Semite, one who denied the Holocaust, and who had, like Corbyn’s ‘friends’ Hamas and Hezbollah, vowed to ‘wipe Israel off the map’, a goal that did not sit easily with Corbyn’s avowed self-appointed role as a peace-maker and the ostensible anti-war aims of his Coalition. But it did with former Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad’s declaration that the objective of Quds Day was the ‘annihilation’ of the Zionist regime’ and that on the day Corbyn addressed the London rally, back in Tehran, Quds Day demonstrators were chanting ‘death to Israel’. In the same spirit, posters on view at the rally addressed by Corbyn included one that proclaimed ‘Israel your Days Are Numbered’, and another, held by a child, which explained, in 1984-style Shariaspoke, that ‘For World Peace Israel must be Destroyed’. A third, clutched by an even younger little girl fully-swathed in regulation Muslim rape-prevention

costume, had a swastika superimposed on the star of David over the word 'Zionazi', and above it, the legend, 'Boycott Apartheid Israel'. Another poster accused Israel of 'genocide'. Unless he had the same problem with his eyesight as with his memory, Corbyn must have seen all these posters from his vantage point on the speaker's platform and on the march that preceded the meeting. A strange setting for a man of the left.

Corbyn, as we have seen in his friendship with Raed Salah of Hamas, also kept on good terms with 9/11 deniers. When the Rev. Stephen Sizer found himself in hot water with the Bishop of Guildford over his on-line claim that Jews and not Muslims were behind the attack on the World Trade Centre, ('Israel did it') Corbyn came to his defence, complaining in a letter to Sizer's superiors that the Vicar was 'under attack by certain individuals intent on discrediting the excellent work [sic] he does in highlighting the injustices of the Palestinian situation', leaving one wondering just who these 'certain individuals' might be. The good Rev. was no stranger to Corbyn. They had shared the same platform at the Iran-sponsored 2012 annual Jew-baiting 'al-Quds Day' event. As for Sizer's 'excellent work', in addition to re-cycling Jewish conspiracy theories, it included finding the time, in the midst of his parochial duties, to fraternize with anti-Semitic Hezbollah leaders, and promote the Sharia leftist 'Stop the War Coalition' (chaired by Corbyn) and Palestinian Solidarity Campaign (founder and Patron, Corbyn). In recognition of his services to the anti-Zionist cause, the Winter 2014 number of the PSC's on-line newsletter, *Palestine News*, came to Sizer's defence, describing what were well-founded accusations of anti-Semitism as a 'witch-hunt'. Corbyn's support for the embattled Vicar was joined by others of a like mind, with one anti-Zionist website claiming that Sizer was a 'truth seeker' who had been 'silenced by Israel's stooges'. Some might find a little odd that while the Reverend Sizer was able to find the time and energy to wage his vendetta against the Jews, the desperate plight of his fellow Christians in the Islamic world, who were being hounded, tormented, gang-raped, forcibly converted and murdered by the thousand in the Middle East and beyond, was not his prime concern in matters beyond his parochial responsibilities. Evidently there were more pressing causes for a man of the cloth. One must see the bigger picture. Again, strange company for a man of the left. However, not the PSC, but Sizer's own church had the last word. After having been suspended from all church duties in 2018 for repeated comments that were deemed anti-Semitic, in December 2022, an unprecedented Church of England public tribunal charged him with no fewer than eleven counts of anti-Semitism, including appearing on a PSC platform (as had Corbyn) with a known Holocaust denier, conduct, said the Tribunal, 'unbecoming of a church minster'. On January 30, 2023, despite (or, more likely, because of his) his 'excellent work' in the anti-Zionist cause, Corbyn's Vicar comrade in arms was defrocked after being found guilty on four charges of anti-Semitism, and banned from preaching for the next ten years. But not from speaking on behalf of the cause closest to his heart, because he was back again in March 2023, addressing the annual anti-Israel London al Qods rally.

As a candidate hoping to be elected to the leadership of one of the UK's two major political parties, even someone of Corbyn's limited intelligence would have realised he had to appeal to a far broader constituency than Holocaust deniers and Jewish conspiracy theorists such as his friends Sizer and Eisen. Consequently, none of these associations, or the causes they represented, featured

in Corbyn's leadership election manifesto, which was devoted almost entirely to domestic issues, which throughout his career, had always take second place to issues and events abroad. This omission, however astute, was far less than honest, because once elected, his prior commitments quickly reasserted themselves. This should have surprised no one familiar with his political provenance.

Inevitably, Corbyn's many years of high-profile campaigning alongside and on behalf of anti-Semites, anti-Zionist Jihadis, Islamic clerics and Holocaust deniers had given rise to questions about his own attitude towards the Jews. The manner in which he responded to them was not to everyone's satisfaction. For example, when criticised for sharing a platform at a Stop the War Coalition rally with Holocaust denier Dyab Abou Jahjah, he evaded the issue by replying that he 'refused to be dragged into this stuff [sic] that somehow or other because we are pro-Palestinian, we're anti-Semitic' (as if there could be no possibility of such a connection). But no one had said that being pro-Palestinian was proof of anti-Semitism. It was Corbyn's track record of associations and collaboration with pro-Palestinians who *were* anti-Semitic that was the problem. (See Appendix T *Jeremy and the Jew-Baiters*) Then there was Corbyn's own attitude towards the Holocaust to consider. Like so many on the left, he saw the need to as it were, cut it down to size, even to 'deJudaify' it, one suspects to counter what was believed by many of the far left to be a Zionist plot to exploit the Holocaust to justify the existence of the state of Israel. As we have seen, some anti-Semites had gone as far as to claim that the Zionist leadership actually collaborated with the Nazis in murdering (anti-Zionist) Jews, precisely in order to generate sympathy for the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine. Corbyn, whose jihadi 'friends' had declared they intended to complete the genocide of the Jews that Hitler went more than half-way to achieving, offered this comment on the Holocaust, whose purpose was clearly designed to 'relativise' what was for those historians who have faithfully recorded it, the greatest crime in human history: 'Why is the slave trade not remembered in the same breath [as the Holocaust] or the genocide of native Americans by the European armies and settlers who came to grab land and wealth using their advantage of technology and weaponry?' While equating the Holocaust with crimes committed by colonising European, as many on the far left do, he made no reference to the equally barbaric conduct of Muslim imperialists with slavery, including, sexual, specifically sanctified by the *Koran* (33:50, 23:5,6, 4:24, 8:69, 24:32) and practised on a no less vast a scale for nearly a thousand years before the transatlantic Christian version was under way, and which continues in Africa to this day long after it was abolished in the civilised world.

Aside from the difficulty of remembering with one's lungs (perhaps this explained Corbyn's memory lapses and why he sometimes struggled to comprehend the most elementary concepts) the answer to Corbyn's question is obvious, so much so that it takes a simpleton not to see it. Treating the Holocaust as uniquely evil, as all but a tiny number of anti-Semitic pseudo historians do, has nothing to do with an implied Zionist perversion of history or, for that matter, any intention to minimise the evils of Western slavery. By the same token, no-one would expect, or should demand, that in dealing with the slave trade (the Islamic as well as the Christian) reference should always be made 'in the same breath' to the Holocaust, and that if this was not done, claim the omission was in some way an attempt to belittle its horrors. This 'relativising' of the Holocaust engaged in by

the anti-Zionist left first emerged as a trend amongst post-war German historians *of the right*, most notably Ernst Nolte, but now, like so much else that was once its preserve, it has migrated to the far left. How else explain that, for example, Corbyn supported a motion in Parliament on Holocaust Memorial Day January 27, 2011, calling for it to be divested of its unique Jewish nature and replaced by a *Genocide* Memorial Day, one applicable also to a mythical Israeli genocide of the Palestinian? Perhaps in his zeal to promote the anti-Zionist cause, he had forgotten that two years previously, in the same building, he had described as his ‘friends’ the terrorist Hamas movement, one of whose aims, as specified in its already cited Covenant article seven, conformed exactly to the United Nations definition of genocide, namely, ‘killing members of the group [in this case, the Jews] ‘with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group.’ There are good grounds for suspecting that Corbyn’s motion was intended to appease fellow anti-Zionists who, like himself, accuse Israel of the genocide of the Palestinians, a charge that Corbyn personally endorsed when he signed the Cairo Declaration of December 2002, which twice in its text made that very same allegation.

Some black politicians and historians have been tempted to go down the same path as Corbyn, though not by inventing a genocide, but by redefining what the word means. US political activist Rev. Jesse Jackson, who in 1984 notoriously referred to New York as ‘Hymietown’, declared himself to be ‘sick and tired of hearing about the Holocaust’, and chose the occasion of a visit to Israel’s Yad Vashem Holocaust memorial to point out that ‘in all, the Nazis killed more non-Jews than Jews’ (none of whom, apart from gypsies, were of races the Nazis sought to exterminate), adding for good measure to say the very least, the highly debatable claim that ‘60 million blacks had been exterminated during the slavery era’. In an interview with *Haaretz*, the Israeli leftist weekly, the black historian Marcus Redeker, author of *The Slave Ship: A Human History*, argued that there had been an ‘African Holocaust’, while conceding that whereas all the Jews were marked down for extermination, ‘the point of the slave trade was not to kill people, but to get as many living bodies to the New World in order to use them to make money.’ That is not what the word genocide means, which is to *deliberately* seek to exterminate a certain racial or ethnic group, as was the case with the Jews, not to enslave it for economic gain. Even so, Redeker’s comment cannot be reconciled with Jackson’s claim of 60 million ‘exterminated’ blacks.

The Corbynista rise in the Labour Party demonstrated that anti-Semitism can suddenly surface in places where one would have once least expected it. A poll conducted in March 2017, found that 80%, yes, 80% of Labour Party members believed that accusations of anti-Semitism made against the party were designed to discredit its leader and stifle criticism of Israel, while 65% considered the Jewish state to be a ‘force for bad’ a percentage considerably higher than for Corbyn’s Press TV employer between 2009 and 2012, Iran, which amongst its many other vile practices, was at that time responsible for half the world’s recorded executions. A survey of UK attitudes towards the Jews conducted in 2015 found that around 40% of respondents harboured anti-Semitic prejudices of one kind or another, many of whom, with this large percentage, would have described themselves as left wing. This was confirmed by a survey conducted by the Campaign Against Anti-Semitism, which found that the more left interviewees placed themselves on the political spectrum, the more likely they were to be anti-

Semitic. Given that most British Jews were likely to be considerably more aware of Corbyn's close relationship with Iran, Islamic terrorists and hostility towards Israel, than the general public, is it then surprising that in a 2017 survey by YouGov, 83% of Jews condemned the Labour Party for its leniency towards anti-Semitism within its own ranks? Possibly with the prospect of a Corbynista government as one of the factors contributing to their concerns, one third of those Jews interviewed said they were considering emigrating from the UK. (One of the reasons why prejudice against Jews is so hard to combat is that it does not acknowledge its own existence. Those who subscribe to bigoted ideas regard them as perfectly normal in so far as they share them with associates of a like mind. This is especially so with anti-Semitism, as it almost always assumes, especially on the left, the guise of a now socially acceptable anti-Zionism.)

Corbyn's more than three decades of single-minded commitment to anti-Zionism extended beyond speech-making, hosting anti-Semitic terrorists and heading various anti-Zionist campaigns. In addition to his literary contributions, it even included, on one occasion, what some might see as justifying criminal violence. In January 2009, during clashes between Hamas and Israel, a Stop the War Coalition rally in support of Hamas outside the Israel embassy degenerated into violence on a scale reminiscent of a Tsarist pogrom. Shops were damaged and looted, and a Starbucks vandalised as retribution for the company's alleged Jewish links with Israel. The scale and level of violence was such that *more than fifty* police officers were injured in the attempt to restore order. Many of those arrested, out of total of more than one hundred, were young Muslim men, some of whom were subsequently convicted, with around 20 receiving prison sentences for various offences committed during the riot. Corbyn, at the time Chairman of the organisation that had staged the protest, one ostensibly dedicated to stopping violence, not providing a vehicle for it, was outraged. While not denying that the violence and destruction had occurred, he excused it. 'People get angry, and the events [sic!] that happened at the end of the demonstration were an expression of anger about what was happening in Gaza...young people have been put into prison sentences essentially [sic] for attending [sic] a demonstration.' Could Corbyn really be so obtuse as to believe what he was saying? They had not been jailed for 'attending' a demonstration. Their hatred of Jews had led them to commit crimes of violence against property and against the police and had paid the penalty that the law of the land required.

As with this demonstration, most of Corbyn's pre-occupations as a back-bench MP had to do with foreign policy issues, or, closer to home, 'the troubles' in Northern Ireland, where he became an apologist for IRA terrorism. In so far as Corbyn had anything that could be described as a foreign policy, it proceeded on the basis of the well-worn but hazardous formula, the enemy of my enemy is my friend. Israel, along with the USA, was of course the main enemy, which made Hezbollah and Hamas his friends, just as NATO did Russia. Indeed, as we have seen, one occasion, Corbyn explicitly refereed to the two terrorist movements as his 'friends'. He even declared his support for what he called a 'political solution' to the emergence of the Islamic State, which necessarily would have involved some kind of recognition of its legitimacy, firstly to conduct negotiations with its Caliph, and secondly, for the 'solution' to be 'political'. Finally, and perhaps this aspect of his proposal was never given serious thought (serious thought not being one of Corbyn's strongest suits) it takes two to negotiate, and

negotiators need to speak the same political language and each to be prepared to make concessions to the other party. What concessions did Corbyn think should have been made to the Islamic State, illegally occupying and terrorising swathes of territory of two sovereign states, Syria and Iraq, so as to further what he called a ‘peace process’? Even after the ISIS massacres in Paris on November 13, 2015, he continued to oppose any military action against the Islamic State. He did not think that ‘bombing is necessarily going to bring about the solution that they think it might’ and predicted that ‘there’s going to be civilian casualties from the bombing of [the Islamic State capital] Raqqa’ This was true. But French President Hollande’s intention, unlike the assassins of November 13, was not to deliberately kill civilians, but to strike back at those who were. Unlike most ‘peace campaigners’, who in a military conflict, say a plague on all houses, irrespective of their relative merits and motives, Corbyn did see the difference between the lesser and the greater evil. The problem was, he always seemed to prefer the greater.

Corbyn’s much-advertised advocacy of peace was as ineffective as it was selective, having had no impact whatsoever on any of the world’s military conflicts, or success in persuading his terrorist friends to abandon their goal of destroying the state of Israel, if indeed that was his intention. Corbyn ‘peace campaigning’, like that of its forerunner, the Kremlin controlled ‘British peace Committee’, was directed exclusively against what he considered to be the greater, if not the sole evil in the world, the West, for example, describing the US conduct in the war against the Saddam regime as ‘appalling’ as that of the Islamic State, while never condemning in the same language atrocities committed by Islamic movements against Israeli civilians. Had Corbyn not seen any of the promotional videos the Islamic State sent around the world depicting the most horrific scenes of decapitations, crucifixions, burlyngs and burnings alive, stonings, immersions in nitric acid baths and mass executions? Did he really believe that this was no worse than the conduct of the US forces in Iraq? One suspects that what Corbyn really found objectionable, though of course he did not say so, was not the behaviour of the US armed forces, but the fact that for all the protests of his Sharia left ‘Stop the War Coalition’, the US and its allies removed from power the fascist and genocidal regime of Saddam Hussein. Corbyn thought that this action called for an apology, which he promised to give should he become Prime Minister. To be consistent he should also demand that the Western Allies (Stalin’s forces one assumes would be exempt) apologise for the civilian casualties they caused in defeating the Axis powers in the Second World War.

Corbyn also believed that it was the West that was exclusively to blame for all the deaths and destruction that ensued during and after the removal of Saddam from power in 2003. This is yet another Corbyn lie. Iraqi civilian deaths caused by the invasion forces were dwarfed by the subsequent waves of slaughter unleashed by Iraqi Sunnis on Shi’as, which were then massively augmented, following the emergence of ISIS in 2014, by the forces of the (also Sunni) Islamic State. Corbyn not only had problems with his memory, but in finding facts to substantiate his assertions. In 2003, the year of the US-led invasion of Iraq, the number of civilian deaths recorded by the post Saddam Iraqi authorities was 12,125. It is perfectly reasonable to conclude that some of these were caused not only by Saddam’s forces, but also inadvertently by the actions of the invading armies.

While it is true that they would not have occurred had there been no invasion, had Saddam remained in power, the number of deaths directly attributable to his own repressive regime, already in the hundreds of thousands, would have continued to rise. But after his removal, the picture changes. As the years went by, conflicts between the US-led coalition forces and the remnants of the Saddam regime gave way to a recrudescence of the age-old civil war within Islam between the once favoured by Saddam, but now displaced Sunni minority in the north, and the now-dominant Shi'a majority in the centre and south. Civilian casualties, caused mainly Sunni terrorists, soared far above the level of the 2003 invasion, reaching 29,441 in 2006 and 26,036 in 2007. A so-called 'surge' by the US forces curbed, but did not eliminate the carnage, which dipped to its lowest point in 2011, with 4,153 civilian deaths. Then, as the US and its allies completed their withdrawal, handing over security responsibilities to the Iraqis, so the so-called 'sectarian' slaughter began to escalate again, according to a UN report, reaching 19,000 between January 2014 and October 2015, proving that this was not, as many on the left claimed, a war of 'resistance' against 'western imperialism', but the resumption of an ancient war of religion between Muslims, which the presence of western forces, far from being its cause, had held in check. The figures for deaths caused by suicide bombings tell the same story. The daily rate of deaths caused by 'martyrdom operations', deployed in this instance not against Jews, but fellow Muslims, stood at 1.5 in the year of the invasion. By 2007, it had risen to 22, that is, 22 per day. The death rate then dropped to an average of six per day, and then in 2013, just before the advent of ISIS, rose again to 10.

When Corbyn said he wished to apologise for this intra-Islamic carnage, he was attributing to military actions of the West in the 21st century the tragic consequences of a blood feud between Sunnis and Shi'as that began thirteen hundred years ago, one which neither party to this today displays any inclination to abandon. Evidently then, Corbyn's obsessional involvement with Muslim causes had taught him next to nothing about the history and nature of Islam. The Taliban's relentless killing of Afghan civilians was also awarded a free pass by Corbyn and Sharia left generally. The UN's Afghanistan Mission began monitoring civilian casualties in 2009. Following the departure, despite Afghan government requests that they stay, of all western combat forces in 2014, as they did in Iraq, civilian casualties suddenly rose the next year to 3,500 deaths and 7,500 wounded, 61% of these being directly caused by the Taliban.

In addition to his embracing various Jihadi causes (including that of the IRA), Corbyn was a long-standing advocate of the UK's withdrawal from NATO and its abandonment of nuclear weapons. His election as Labour Leader was therefore music to the ears of the Kremlin, especially since Corbyn, for decades a CND activist and both its vice chair and president, had previously blamed the Ukrainian crisis on the West (see above), and not the imperial ambitions of former KGB operative Vladimir Putin who, in vintage Stalinist style, arranged the murder of anyone, both at home and abroad, whom he judged a threat to his rule. So in an article on the Ukraine for the 'Stop the War Coalition', far from seeking to stop Putin's proxy war against the Ukraine in the Donbas, Corbyn accused NATO of 'an attempt to encircle Russia', no mean achievement, given the enormous length of Russia's borders (20,241 kilometres, mostly with states closely aligned with Moscow) and coast line (37,653 kilometres) the major part of which lies above the Arctic Circle. Has this geography dunce never seen a map of Russia? Did he not

know that poor encircled Russia was not only by far the largest country in the world, but also possessed the world's largest nuclear arsenal and second largest army?

As Putin quite openly stepped up his logistic support for far-right Russian militias in eastern Ukraine, and with Corbyn still its Chairman, on February 22, 2015, the Stop the War Coalition joined with the Kremlin's puppet 'Solidarity with Ukraine' (sic!) to protest outside the US embassy against 'US and NATO arming of the Kiev regime', (that is, Ukraine's legitimate and, unlike a number of 'regimes' supported by Corbyn, democratically-elected government) this being supposedly part of a larger plan 'to guard the strategic interests of the EU [sic] and the North American imperialist powers'. Putin of course, like his Soviet predecessors, had no 'strategic interests', only legitimate defensive ones. Labour MPs who accused Corbyn and his pro-Putin leadership staff of undermining the party's Remain campaign little more than a year later needed to look no further than this statement as to their motives.

Corbyn's apologia for Russian aggression in the Ukraine, and his refusal to condemn its bombing operations in Syria while opposing those by western powers against the Islamic State, suggested that when it came to wars and invasions, some needed to be endorsed and justified, not stopped. Intriguingly, in one of several policy overlaps, Corbyn's anti-Europeanism also coincided with that of Donald Trump's, who even as far back as 2000, argued that 'their [i.e., Europe's] conflicts are not worth American lives.' Also like Corbyn, Trump was a vehement critic of the US military interventions in Iraq to remove Saddam Hussein - 'possibly the worst decision that has been made in the history of our country' - and in Afghanistan against the Taliban, 'we made a terrible mistake getting involved there in the first place', statements that surely qualified him for high office in the Corbynista Stop the War Coalition. Trump's opposition to the US-led removal of Saddam Hussein was not the only instance of right-wing opposition to the US-led operation. In the course of his investigation into far-right infiltration of the US armed forces, Matt Kennard in his *Irregular Army* discovered that

the American Neo-Nazi movement was for the most part virulently against the war in Iraq. Most of the groups hold to an updated conspiracy theory about Jewish power, which they call ZOG, or Zionist Occupation Government. It is premised on Western governments supposed submission to Jewish and Israeli power. [This claim is also promoted both on the far left and the Jihadi movements supported by it, in the first place Corbyn's 'friends', Hamas and Hezbollah.] On their internet forums, US soldiers are often greeted with incendiary comments about being "Jewish warriors" and "Zionist crusaders" for fighting in the War on Terror. ...Charles Wilson, spokesman for the National Socialist Movement, tells me the group is "150 per cent against the war in Iraq".

National KKK Director Pastor (sic) Thomas Robb told Kennard that 'we have opposed the war in Iraq since day one', while another Neo-Nazi, the US army veteran Forrest Fogarty, made it clear that while he fought in Iraq, he didn't 'believe in the War on terror. It was a war to protect Israel; I don't think we need to be over there; I just went...I don't like it when people call me a warrior for Israel.'

The Trump-Corbyn convergence was not confined to foreign policy, as Corbyn's Shadow Foreign Secretary, Emily Thornberry, readily conceded: 'To

give him his credit...Donald Trump was talking about the importance of investing in jobs and infrastructure, and in the economies across the country, not just the main cities, and that's right'. As opponents of 'globalisation', they both rejected what Corbyn called 'free-trade dogma'. A Corbyn 'aide' also confirmed the Labour Leader's 'inner circle' had been 'inspired [sic!] by Trump's success in America'. In Corbyn's own words, 'the Leave and Trump campaigns succeeded because they both recognised the system [sic...a term much favoured by far-right populists] was broken and the people [and another] weren't being listened to.'

And the populist similarities did not stop there. There was also the not unimportant matter of their political style and strategy. Both Trump and Corbyn presented themselves as outsiders taking on their respective 'establishments' in Washington and Westminster, and railed against a supposed media conspiracy, one which in Corbyn's case, had allegedly assumed a Zionist character, with an Israeli veto over BBC coverage of the Middle East. Both had an undisguised admiration for 'strong men' opposed to the liberal democratic west. Both defied the odds and their critics by sweeping the board in internal contests for their party's leadership, and by so doing split them from top to bottom. Both generated a fanatical cult following unique in the modern history of their countries, one that stimulated a brisk trade in T-Shirts emblazoned with their saviour's name and attracted support from the more unsavoury fringes of the political spectrum at home and abroad. Both were addicted to tweeting and media stunts and mobilised their own 'militias', Trump the 'Proud Boys' and a loose coalition of white supremacists, and Corbyn, Momentum. Both claimed they had been the victim of vast conspiracies, Trump that his 'landslide' victory in the 2020 Presidential election had been 'stolen' from him by Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez, who died in 2013, and Corbyn that his defeat in the general election of 2019 was due to the unprecedented hostility of the UK media and the 'weaponising' of false charges of anti-Semitism. The convergence had been so striking, one commentator described it as Corbyn's 'Trumpification', while another referred to the Labour Leader as 'the Trump of the left'. One important difference had been their performance at the polls. While Trump defied all the pundits by winning in 2016, (albeit with a minority of the votes cast), Corbyn fell 64 seats short of an overall majority in the general election of 2017. Two years later, in council elections and for the EU Parliament, Labour's share of the vote plummeted to the lowest level in the party's entire history, followed in December of the same year by its worst general election result since 1935. Another difference, which was related to the first, is that whereas Trump's support was broadly and firmly based in the Republican electorate, drawing with it, with varying degrees of conviction, a sizable number of Republican Senators and Representatives, Corbyn's stood on a much narrower foundation, no more than thirty or so MPs, re-activated constituency leftists, students and far left entryists. A series of surveys established that the overwhelming majority of Labour voters, with the exception of Muslims, wanted no part of him.

To understand why Corbyn and those around him became so committed to the defence of the oligarch-friendly Putin regime, it is necessary to locate their orientation in its historical and geo-political contexts. Beginning in Tsarist times, when the autocracy fought a series of wars against Ottoman Turkey, Russia has had long-standing interests in the region, one of which was unimpeded access to the Mediterranean. These attempted incursions were always resisted by the

western powers, most notably in the Crimean war in the mid-nineteenth century, in which Marx took the side of the West against what he called the ‘dark Asiatic power’ of Russia (See Appendix XIV). Turkey’s alignment with Germany and Austria in the First World War of necessity brought a reversal of western policy in the so-called ‘Near East’, presenting Russian Pan Slavists with the opportunity to re-assert their claim to Constantinople as one of their war aims, one which only lapsed with the fall of the Romanov dynasty in March 1917 and the Bolshevik’s withdrawal from the war a year later. Only in the mid-1950s did Moscow resume its bid to assert itself in a region which for millennia had been the battle-ground between empires, races, cultures and religions. It reached a high point over the next decade, with arms deals with Israel’s Arab neighbours and enemies, and then gradually declined after Israel’s crushing victory over Egypt, Syria and Jordan in the ‘Six Day War’ of June 1967. (See Chapter 7) Beginning with Egyptian President Sadat’s defection from his alliance with Moscow in the 1970s, the Kremlin’s grip on the Middle East progressively weakened over the next three decades. Following the US-brokered Oslo Accords of 1993 and then ten years later, the removal of Saddam Hussein in Iraq, a post-Soviet Moscow was left with Ba’athist Syria as its only client state in the entire region, one which also has close links with Iran, and sponsors, along with Iran, one of Corbyn’s Jihadi ‘friends’, Hezbollah. Iran, its turn, enjoys the best of relations with Putin, who has supplied the Ayatollahs with ballistic missiles capable of reaching targets far beyond its main enemy, Israel. (In return, Iran supplied Putin with drones for his war against Ukraine.) Only yet another covert Mossad ‘special forces’ operation will prevent Iran arming its missile warheads with nuclear weapons, in total violation of its 2015 agreement with the western powers not to do so.

It is these admittedly complex relationships, part religious (Hezbollah, Iran and the ruling clique in Syria are all Shi’a) part geopolitical, that are the key to understanding why Corbyn not only acted as the advocate for Palestinian Jihadis, but felt obliged to defend the expansionist policies of regimes that stood behind them. (Syria and Iran, together with Hamas and Hezbollah, endorsed Putin’s 2022 invasion of Ukraine, while Corbyn blamed it on NATO’s ‘eastern expansion’. For details, see Appendix XIV) Like his press officer Seamus Milne, Corbyn valued Russia’s role as a counterweight to NATO. He also for the same reason took the side of the Ayatollahs because, since the ‘Islamic Revolution’ of 1979, the USA, the ‘Great Satan’ had been, together with the ‘Zionist Entity’, their number one enemy. Shi’a Iran’s enmity towards its regional rival, Sunni Saudi Arabia, is both geo-political and religious, and one that Corbyn naturally shared, hence his readiness to condemn the Kingdom’s atrocious human rights record, and his silence concerning Iran’s. (See Appendix X) Hence also the Stop the War Coalition’s as well as Corbyn’s studied refusal to condemn the numerous war crimes, including the use of chemical weapons, committed by Assad and his Russian allies, even though this proved too much even for some his loyalist supporters to stomach. In October 2016, a letter addressed to the former Chairman of the ludicrously misnamed ‘Stop the War Coalition’, signed by 70 of his devotees, implored him to break his silence and to ‘condemn, clearly and specifically, the actions of Assad and Russia in Syria, which have caused the overwhelming majority of civilian deaths and which present the biggest obstacle to any workable solution to the Syria crisis’. The appeal fell on deaf ears.

Anyone attending the Stop the War Coalition annual conference in London on October 8, 2016 would have witnessed the proof that given Corbyn's long-standing commitment to the Shia axis, and his former employment by Syria's Iranian allies, the possibility of a condemnation of the many atrocities committed by the Assad regime was, at best, remote in the extreme. Demonstrators outside and, before they were silenced or ejected, inside the meeting, staged protests against the Coalition's, and specifically, Corbyn's refusal to condemn Assad's (and thus also Putin's) war crimes. During the Labour Leader's address to the conference, there were cries of 'Jeremy Corbyn, where were you?', 'what about Aleppo' (flattened by repeated Russian chemical bombing raids) and 'your silence is complicit'. Corbynista loyalists drowned out further protests by chanting 'no more wars', excepting of course those waged by Putin and Assad. Corbyn's response was to recommend the same policy that he had advocated as the alternative to military action against the Islamic State, namely, a 'political solution'. Outside the meeting, an ejected protestor accused Chemical Corbyn of having 'deliberately marginalised Syrian voices', that he would 'never say the words, "Assad must go"'. Compensation for the lost support among his own cultic following came from a quarter some may have found disquieting; namely the endorsement of Corbyn's pro-Assad stance by Nick Griffin, the one-time *Fuehrer* of the Neo-Nazi British National Party. He tweeted: 'If he [Corbyn] sticks to his guns then for the first time in my life, I will vote Labour. NOTHING is more important than resisting the psychotic rush to World War 3 of [Foreign Secretary] Boris and the neo-cons. Corbyn refuses to blame Assad for chemical attack in Syria.' (Griffin, like Corbyn, had been a guest of Assad, though not like Corbyn, once, and another of his far right admirers, former KKK Grand Wizard David Duke, twice, but three times.)

Corbyn's commitment to the foreign no less than the domestic policies of the Iranian theocracy and its surrogates in Syria and Lebanon was total and unshakable. And just as throughout his career as MP he had been a consistent opponent of both NATO and the European Union ('tools of US policy') he never wavered in his hostility to Israel. Right up to his emergence as a candidate for the Labour Party leadership, he continued to foster his links with all manner of anti-Zionists, being none too choosy as to their provenance. In October 2014, Corbyn hosted yet another Parliamentary anti-Zionist 'event' at which one of the guest speakers was none other than fellow Press TV presenter James Thring. Although locating himself on the extreme right (he is an associate of David Duke, who as we shall see, like Thring, enthused over Corbyn's election as Labour Leader) when it came to Zionism, Thring talked the talk of the Sharia left, for example defending Ghaddafi against charges of sponsoring terrorism when the reality was, they had been 'invented by Mossad'. Israel, said Thring, was 'an illegal, criminal, psychopathic, belligerent apartheid entity bent on desecrating the Holy Land and destroying anyone or even any country [sic] that tries to seek justice for the Palestinians.' Thring also had impeccable anti-Semitic credentials as an associate of such professional Jew-baiters and Holocaust deniers as the two blue-blooded Neo-Nazis, Dowager Lady Birdwood and Lady Michele Renouf, together with David Irving and Chomsky associate Serge Thion. Thring had also appeared as a presenter with former BNP Vice Chairman Richard Edmonds in a pro-Nazi video on the Allied bombing of Dresden. Yet he was a featured speaker at Corbyn's Westminster 'event', while on July 26, 2014, Renouf and Thring both marched

with Corbyn in support of Hamas in its war against Israel. Sometimes Corbyn's anti-western zeal carried him beyond the call of duty, in doing so, running the risk of making himself a laughing stock, as when he praised Iran's farcically-named and government-sponsored 'Iranian Human Rights Commission,' declaring that he 'like[d] the sense of values surrounding it'.

The 'values' which Corbyn shared with the Commission were reflected in his diplomatic silence as the clerical fascists who ruled Iran carried out an average of an execution of one a day in the four years of his employment with Press TV press, and when his admired Commission celebrated the Paris massacre of the *Charlie Hebdo* staff by conferring on its victims an 'Islamophobe of the Year' award. Corbyn, being infinitely gullible, possibly really did believe that the Commission existed to protect what were in reality non-existent human rights in Iran. But like Corbyn, it had nothing to say when two Iranian poets, Fateme Ekhtesari and Mehdi Massavi, were sentenced in October 2015 by an Islamic court to 99 lashes and nine and eleven and a half years in prison respectively for 'undermining the security of the Islamic state'. Ekhtesari, since she wrote from a feminist perspective, was predictably accused by the court of 'passing dangerous messages that could encourage people to distance themselves from the true faith', one which Corbyn, like Obama, on every possible occasion praised for its tolerant and peaceful nature. Just as predictably, neither were there any protests on her behalf from her western sisters, their enemy being western imperialism's ruling 'white patriarchy', not Muslim misogyny. The two jailed poets were far from being the only writers to run afoul of Iran's Thought Police. The poet Hashem Saabani was hanged in 2014 after making a forced confession, Stalinist Show Trial fashion, on Iranian TV, while the leftist poet Sa'id Sultanpour was abducted on his wedding day on the orders of Ayatollah Khomeini and murdered in prison without even a mock trial. Rahman Hatefi-Monfared met a similar fate, having his veins cut and then left to bleed to death in prison. All told, the number of writers murdered by the Iranian theocrats exceeds one hundred. If only they had just written, 'death to Israel, death to America'.

Until Labour's defeat at the May 2015 General Election, the 66-year-old Corbyn had never been seen, except by a small circle of admiring co-thinkers, as anything other than a dim-witted, harmless crank, a peace and human rights campaigner with a soft spot for dictators, torturers, Jew-baiters, theocrats, war criminals, Holocaust deniers, Jewish conspiracy theorists, invaders and terrorists, an exotic if also odious hang-over from the Labour Party's self-destructive pre-Blair past, a political lightweight, to put it as its kindest, into all manner of fringe causes, most of them with a very pronounced Islamic flavour, a professional back-bench rebel with bees in his bonnet about the sins of Zionism in particular and the west generally, regarded by most of his Parliamentary colleagues essentially as a yesterday's man serving out his time. And yet despite his long-term associations with all manner of political pond life, some saw him as endowed with almost saintly qualities. Either uninformed or unconcerned about his intimate connections with those I have just listed, the pop singer-turned-pundit Charlotte Church captured perfectly the quasi-religious yearnings of the Corbyn cult when she claimed to have discerned in him 'something inherently [sic!] virtuous'. Somebody needed to tell her about the virtuous one's dealings with Jihadis who slaughtered Jews and clerics who hanged gays and murdered poets.

When Corbyn entered the lists as a contender for the Labour Party leadership, his activities and interests, which had for years been on the fringe of left wing politics, dramatically moved centre stage. Previously, independently of Corbyn, though with his support and participation, there had already emerged a broadly based 'anti-austerity' movement directed against the Tory government's economic and social policies. Though supported by the far left, and as part of that, its Sharia wing, the vast majority of its largely youthful participants were activated by purely domestic 'bread and butter' issues, as was evident from the banners and posters on display on its demonstrations. All this changed when Corbyn scraped up just enough Labour MPs' votes to enter the leadership contest, some of these coming from MPs who, though opposed to his policies, wanted to 'open up' the contest to a left winger. The entirely unintended result was to 'open up' the Labour Party to a Trojan Horse invasion that would dwarf the Jihadi Muslim teachers' Birmingham schools operation in its magnitude and political consequences. Taking advantage of ill-considered new voting rules, genuine 'anti-austerity' activists, organised non-and anti-Labour party leftists (along with Tories who, correctly, as it turned out, saw Corbyn as a certain election loser) registered as members for a fee of only £3, to vote in as the new Labour leader someone who, for all his leftist credentials, also consortred with Irish and Palestinian terrorists, pro-Putin Stalinists, Latin American dictators, Hitler-admirers, Nazi apologists, anti-Semitic clerics and Holocaust and 9/11 deniers. Though lionised by celebrities and well-healed lefties, he was however far less popular with Labour voters, with only one in five favouring him as the new party leader.

We can be reasonably sure that the Jihadi dimension to his political agenda had been unknown to the vast majority of those drawn into the anti-austerity campaign and who now saw him as the obvious candidate to support. But this was certainly not the case with the politically more seasoned, who would have had first-hand knowledge of his long and many associations with the anti-Zionist cause. Corbyn's election campaign thus acquired a dual character, the populist flavoured 'anti-austerity' agenda which Corbyn, largely by default, had successfully hijacked, and that of the Sharia left, which Corbyn had faithfully promoted for most of his years as a Labour MP. Once the second came under media scrutiny, the challenge was to somehow prevent it from alienating supporters of the first. Subsequent events would prove, quite shamefully for those concerned, that if such fears were indeed entertained, they were to prove groundless.

The direction in which Corbyn's bandwagon was rolling could be easily ascertained from those who were scrambling for a ride on it. On board along with Livingstone, Galloway (not even a Labour Party member, but who cared?) and the whole tribe of professional Zionist baiters were three other non-members: anti-voting campaigner, champagne anarchist Russell Brand, who justified the use of terrorist tactics by Hamas against Israel; 'socialist realist' film director Ken Loach and one-time supporter of the Gaddafi-financed Workers Revolutionary Party, who in 1987 directed the play *Perdition*, written by another old Healyite, Jimmy Allen, which accused Zionists of collaborating with the Nazis in the Final Solution, and was prominent in the anti-Israeli Boycott Disinvestment and Sanctions campaign; and the academic Mary Beard, who made her political debut in September 2001 when, after 9/11, she proclaimed in print and on air that 'they [that is, 2,793 office workers] had it coming', a sentiment echoed by Corbyn's

cynical ‘what goes around comes around’. The incurably politically promiscuous Sharia Roman Catholic Galloway, who before Saddam Hussein’s fall, was captured on camera in Baghdad saluting the genocidal dictator for his ‘courage’, ‘strength’ and ‘indefatigability’, like many of the far left, effortlessly combined his endorsement of the pro-Muslim migrant Corbyn with support for the anti-migrant UKIP-led campaign to vote the UK out the European Union.

A survey of the leadership contest conducted in the closing days of the campaign confirmed that Corbyn had indeed attracted substantial support from those with views on foreign policy that can be broadly categorised as approximating those of his Sharia leftist and Muslim allies. 28% agreed with the statement that ‘the world is controlled by a [unspecified] secret elite’ compared with an average of 14% for the other three candidates, 45% opposed the RAF bombing the Islamic State, as against 18% for the remaining three, while 51% agreed with the statement that ‘the USA is the greatest threat to world peace’, compared with an average of 18% for the rest. These proved to be significant variations.

What most of Corbyn’s extra-Parliamentary activities and connections had in common was a visceral hostility towards the United States and Israel and, though it was usually in the case of non-Muslims disguised as anti-Zionism, associations with those who chief loathing was directed at Jews. As a result, because of these associations, for all his posturing as a life-long opponent of racism, accusations of anti-Semitism and its attendant conspiracy theories followed Corbyn around like bad smells. When reports of these links began filtering into the mainstream media, rather late in the day it must be said, Labour’s Jewish shadow Northern Ireland spokesman, Ivan Lewis, condemned Corbyn’s ‘anti-Semitic rhetoric’, and called for a policy of ‘Zero tolerance’ in the Labour Party towards prejudice against Jews. The non-observant Jewish journalist Nick Cohen weighed in with a few choice comments. Understandably alarmed, unlike the Sharia left, at the however unlikely prospect of the election of a Labour government led by a politician with Corbyn’s profile, the *Jewish Chronicle* challenged him to account for his known and acknowledged connections and collaboration with avowed ‘Holocaust deniers, terrorists and some outright anti-Semites.’: ‘It is little short of astonishing that a man who chooses to associate with racists and extremists is about to become the leader of one of our two major parties and conceivably become Prime Minister’.

All of these charges were true. The heat was now, at last, on Corbyn, even if, disgracefully, it had been left to a Jewish MP, a Jewish journalist and a Jewish weekly to apply it. When the story broke, as if to confirm the *Chronicle*’s accusations, as one of the organisation’s sponsors, Corbyn had been due to speak at a Palestinian Solidarity Campaign event in London, where one of the guests invited was the cartoonist Carlos Lattuf. As his speciality was depicting Jews as Nazis, he had entered the Iranian theocracy’s 2015 anti-Semitic Holocaust cartoon competition (first prize \$12,000). Another speaker was an Iranian academic who approved of suicide bombings of Israeli Jews. Caught with his Sharia trousers down, the ‘inherently virtuous’ Corbyn, without explaining why, hurriedly withdrew from the event, even though it was in no way any different in either its purpose or composition from the many he had either hosted himself at Westminster or addressed in public in his years as a Labour MP. His campaign staff (but not Corbyn himself) initially issued a statement which not only

dissociated Corbyn from the views of 9/11 conspiracist Eisen, but also denied that Corbyn had ever had any dealings with him. Another convenient lapse of memory? So, either Eisen or Corbyn's staff was lying. But when challenged directly over his association with Eisen, Corbyn admitted that Eisen's account of his dealings with himself were all true, even to the extent of Corbyn's funding his wretched little band of Jew-baiters. Feeling the trap closing, Corbyn tried another tack, claiming that if he had known of Eisen's views about the Holocaust, he would never have associated himself with Eisen or lent Eisen's group his support, because 'Holocaust deniers are vile and wrong'. Likewise, one hopes, Holocaust celebrators. Yet both categories were to be found in substantial numbers among his collaborators, including those Corbyn chose to call his 'friends'. As for Corbyn not being aware of Eisen's anti-Semitism, this was yet another lie. Let us recall that Eisen had been treated as a pariah even by his own PSC, for reasons that Corbyn must have been well aware of. Leaving aside for the moment Corbyn's public, well-documented, acknowledged and long-term associations with other anti-Semites who were presumably no less 'vile and wrong' for sharing Eisen's rejection of the Holocaust, let me pose this question: How could it be that a veteran MP with Prime Ministerial ambitions remained on friendly terms for the best part of *fifteen years* with someone holding well-advertised views about the Jews so 'vile' as to exclude him even from the company of the UK's main anti-Zionist movement, one, moreover, of which Corbyn was both a founder and a patron, fund Eisen's activities and *even attend the anti-Semite's annual meetings*, and yet still not have so much as an inkling as to what his opinions were?

This is indeed extraordinary, leaving us with only two possible explanations: either Corbyn was such a gullible fool that it rendered him unfit to hold any public office, however humble, let alone be a party leader or, Allah forbid, a Prime Minister, or he was a liar. Let us be charitable and opt for the first. But there was no repudiation, either by Corbyn or his campaign staff, of his high profile and well-advertised associations with and endorsements of his 'friends' Hamas and Hezbollah, or denial of the connections that we have listed with Jewish conspiracy theorists and anti-Semites, ranging from the Holocaust-denying Thring to Muslim convert Abdur Raheen Green and the Rev. Stephen Sizer. How could there be, since all were a matter of public record? Maybe some anti-Semites are less 'vile' than others.

Whether it was the intention or not, the charge of anti-Semitism threw the spotlight on the dual nature of Corbyn's leadership bid. Given Corbyn's very public track record on Israel and assiduous cultivation of his links with Muslim politicians, institutions, anti-Semitic pressure groups, terrorists and clerics, and leaving aside the motives of Tory tactical voters and politically naive anti-austerity activists, it was not difficult to identify other potential sources of the flood of bogus Labour party membership applications that followed Corbyn's announcement of his intention to stand as the Party's new leader. What we had here was another 'Operation Trojan Horse', also one with an Islamic dimension, though executed not by stealth, but by invitation.

In the course of a number of promotional interviews with Corbyn, the normally virulently anti-Labour *Socialist Worker* marvelled (perhaps because in the rape crisis-ridden SWP, the flow had been in the opposite direction) at the 'numbers of people joining Labour to take part in the election', and that 'masses' were attending Corbyn's rallies. Alex Callinicos, who had once warned of the dangers

of allowing 'all sorts of political [i.e., socialist] demands' to jeopardise his party's harmonious relationship with Muslim pressure groups, now enthused about a leftist campaign being 'borne forward by a tidal wave of enthusiasm', an 'extra-parliamentary movement that has grown up around him [in other words, a cult] that will remain his source of strength.' While SWP General Secretary Charles Kimber sounded a more sceptical note, arguing that even under Corbyn's leadership, Labour would remain an obstacle rather than an ally, he drew attention to one issue that 'set him apart from the three other candidates': 'At one recent event Corbyn supported boycotts and disinvestment against Israel in support of the Palestinians.' Here for Sharia left watchers was surely a straw in the wind. But although wishing 'good luck to him', Kimber seemed to be making it clear that his party would not consent to its members taking the steps necessary to vote for Corbyn: 'We are not joining Labour or registering as members - a process that requires a pledge that "I support the aims and values of the Labour Party and I am not a supporter of any organisation opposed to it."'

Since when has lying proved an obstacle to leftists seeking to worm their way into the Labour party? Did not Lenin, in his once well-known *Left-Wing Communism: An Infantile Disorder*, a polemic against revolutionaries who refused to work inside mass reformist organisations, demand that they must cast aside their scruples and be prepared to 'resort to various stratagems, artifices and illegal methods, to evasions and subterfuges'? (Here, as in so many other respects, Lenin radically deviated from principles enunciated by Marx and Engels in their *Communist Manifesto*: 'The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims'.) Perhaps the SWP's General Secretary was unaware not only of Lenin's advocacy of the tactic later known as 'entryism', but of his own party's history. From the early 1950s to the mid-1960s, all the UK's warring Trotskyists groups were 'entryists', including Tony Cliffe's International Socialists, forerunner of the Socialist Workers Party, along with Gerry Healy's Socialist Labour League (after 1973, 'Workers Revolutionary Party', the WRP) and the Militant 'tendency' led by Ted Grant, surely the world's most boring Leninist. As 'entryists', all, in different ways and at different times, as Lenin and, in the later 1930s, Trotsky advised, had feigned loyalty to a party whose democratic values and reformist policies they all repudiated.

Evidence that the party line was not quite as Kimber claimed came two weeks later when, with Corbyn's leadership prospects threatened by the (long overdue) exposure of his many fraternal associations with Holocaust deniers, anti-Semites and Jihadis, the August 16 on-line Newsletter of the SWP front, the doubly-misnamed Stop the War Coalition (of which Corbyn had been one its founders and Chairpersons), carried a reproduction of the Labour leadership ballot paper and instructions on 'how to vote for Corbyn!' Here we had it: 'We are all Corbynites now!' And sure enough, following Corbyn's election, the SWP, along with a number of other leftist groups, joined the so called 'Momentum' campaign to purge the Parliamentary Labour Party of its majority of anti-Corbyn MPs by securing their de-selection before the next General Election, and their replacement by Corbynite stooges. By their involvement in this operation, the Sharia left had officially endorsed Corbyn as their 'Palestinian Candidate' for the next General Election. But so had, unofficially, numerous Tories, including a government minister. By cross checking the May 2015 General Election canvass returns with the names and addresses of the 300,000 or so new applicants for Labour Party

membership (double the party's pre-Corbyn membership) it was discovered that at least 20% of these applicants had declared their intention to vote for parties other than Labour at the 2015 General Election. Incredibly, a proposal to disqualify Tory entryists from voting in the leadership election, even though it was backed by the party's legal advisers, was blocked by Corbyn supporters on the Labour Party's National Executive Committee. If Corbyn's victory required Tory votes, so be it. Strange allies for a man of the left.

After becoming Party Leader, some argued in Corbyn's defence that the accusations brought against him of anti-Semitism were a classic case of seeking to establish a 'guilt by association', as indeed one of his most loyal, if not brightest supporters, Diane Abbott claimed to be the case. 'Jeremy has done thousands of meetings rallies and memorial events. Now [but why only 'now'?] if over those thirty years he has been on a platform with someone who is clear now [again] is an anti-Semite, given the chaotic [sic] character of the liberation [i.e., anti-Zionist] movement, that will happen. That doesn't make Jeremy an anti-Semite.' This attempt at a defence of the indefensible was puerile. There are several kinds of association one person can have with another, and nearly all will by their very nature and setting be entirely innocent. A casual conversation with a total stranger on a bus about the weather belongs to this category, even if the stranger, without advertising it in any way, happens to be an advocate of Holocaust denial. But the same cannot be said if it was not such a single chance encounter, but a series of deliberate associations on regular basis, for 'thirty years' and on 'thousands' of occasions, such as Abbott said Corbyn had participated in, willingly and knowingly, for the explicit and mutually agreed purpose of common political action directed against a Jewish state, with a person or persons whose denial of the Holocaust and hostility towards the Jews were a matter of public record. So much for Abbotts 'now'. This is indeed guilt, better defined as one of *collaboration*, in criminal law, joint enterprise, rather than mere association, and would, if tested in a court of law, be proved to be such, as it indeed it was in the failed libel action brought in 2000 by the historian David Irving against Penguin books and Professor Deborah Lipstadt for allegations made about Irving in her book, *Denying the Holocaust - The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory*. One of the allegations objected to by Irving was that his association with anti-Semitic movements and individuals was sufficient grounds to prove that he shared their views about the Jews. The movements and individuals in question, all of Neo-Nazi provenance, were identical in their hatred of the Jews, advocacy of Jewish conspiracy theories and denial of the Holocaust to those Corbyn had associated with. Rejecting Irving's claim that he was being accused of guilt by association, in his final ruling, Justice Gray had 'no doubt that most, if not all of them, are Neo-Nazis and who are racist and anti-Semitic. I also have no doubt that Irving was aware of their political views. [Just as Corbyn must have been of those of his platform companions.] His association with such individuals indicates in my judgement that Irving shares many of their political beliefs.'

If Corbyn had been so ill-advised as to instigate libel proceedings in response to an identical and no less well-founded accusation, the Irving case had provided the legal precedent for an identical verdict. (See Appendix T for a catalogue of his online and personal associations with avowed anti-Semites, including one who cited approvingly from *Mein Kampf*, and another who recycled the myths of the *Protocols* as proof of a world Jewish conspiracy.) Corbyn did not help his case

when in July and then August of 2018, two videos came to light of his speaking at two anti-Zionist hate-fests. He said of the first, which he hosted at Westminster, that ‘in pursuit of justice for the Palestinian people’, he had ‘on occasion [sic] appeared on platforms with people whose views I completely [sic] reject.’ ‘Completely’? But how could that be? Surely, they at the very least shared what he described as his ‘pursuit of justice for the Palestinian people’. Otherwise, what were they, or he, doing on the same anti-Zionist platform? Nobody, least of all a seasoned politician and campaigner like Corbyn, appears on platforms with speakers with whom they share *nothing*. Of the second meeting, where Israel was compared to Nazi Germany, a spokesman said on his behalf that ‘Mr Corbyn was not responsible for everything said at every meeting he has attended’. That would be true if Corbyn was sitting in the audience. But he had not just ‘attended’ this meeting. *Corbyn was a featured speaker*, sharing the platform with another speaker who had been invited to appear on it by the PSC, presumably, as is the normal procedure at such events, with the knowledge and agreement of his or her platform partner(s). In this case, Corbyn’s platform partner was a speaker who compared Israel with Nazi Germany. If indeed Corbyn found that statement repugnant, especially in view of his status in the PSC as its founder and Patron, it would have not only been within his rights, but his duty, to say from the platform at that meeting that such views had no place in the PSC. But there is irrefutable evidence that they do (I refer the reader again to Appendix T), and, moreover, that Corbyn shares them. So he remained silent, preferring to maintain the united front of all anti-Zionists, no matter what their views on the ‘Jewish question’ might be. On a platform in Trafalgar Square, Corbyn demanded that everyone shows respect for a religion that preaches hatred and genocide against the Jews. But when the target is Israel, literally anything goes.

Aside from his domestic agenda, which is another question entirely and does not concern us here, his record and associations, taken together with his endorsements by the Sharia left, are proof that for all his many Palestinian affiliations, Corbyn was no standard bearer for socialist internationalism. Quite the contrary in fact. As we have seen, he served as the mouthpiece for the most reactionary, theocratic and anti-Semitic tendencies of Palestinian nationalism. Some of his comments on Middle Eastern and Islamic affairs display a level of sophistication that one would expect from someone who after attending a prep school, scraped two Es at A level and then failed to complete a spoof degree in ‘Trade Union Studies’. We have already noted his observation that the killing of Bin Laden, the architect of 9/11, was a ‘tragedy’. He easily trumped this however when, on learning of reports that ‘Jihadi John’, the UK born Muslim assassin who appeared on a video decapitating an Islamic State prisoner, had been killed by a US drone attack, he responded that it would have been ‘far better if he had been arrested’. Corbyn neglected to give any details as to how this was to be done. Presumably, due process was to be effected by dispatching a UK police constable, armed with a warrant card, a truncheon and a pair of handcuffs, to the Islamic State, who then, on his arrival in Raqqa, the capital of the Islamic State, would enquire of the Caliph as to the whereabouts of the said offender. On receiving this information from the Islamic State authorities, he would then, after locating and cautioning the suspect and informing him of his rights, place him under arrest, cuff him, and escort him back to the UK to stand trial, though on what specific charge Corbyn neglected to specify. I suggest breach of the peace.

You Are My Sunshine

The election on September 2015 of Jeremy Corbyn as leader of the Labour Party with 59% of first preference votes cast should have come as no surprise to those who were familiar with the ways of the far left. As I have argued in the main body of this work, given a favourable conjuncture of events and forces, and the incompetence and cowardice of its opponents, the far left can exert an influence out of all proportion to its numerical strength. Emulating their Bolshevik exemplars in their capture of the Russian Soviets in 1917, albeit on a far more modest scale and with less disastrous consequences, they have time and again proved themselves past masters in the art of subverting and then manipulating the machinery of organisations and institutions created by others for other purposes. Corbyn, who until the summer of 2015 was deservedly largely unknown to the general public and even to most Labour voters, bumbled as much as burst onto the UK political scene not because he possessed any great political acumen or charisma, but because, as much to his own surprise as anyone else's, he found himself serving as the fulcrum of three largely disparate movements with which he had shared an involvement. Of the first two, one was quite recent, comprising largely young anti-austerity activists; the other consisting of residual and recently revived 'Old Labour' leftists. Though generationally distinct, both had been concerned mainly with domestic economic and social issues. The third was the anti-Zionist movement, an amalgam of the Sharia left and Muslim pressure groups, whose emergence and convergence dated back to 9/11 and the Iraq War of 2003. The two entirely distinct policy concerns could not be easily reconciled. Corbyn's Hamas 'friends', whose Covenant claimed that socialism was an invention of the World Jewish Conspiracy, were no more concerned with the parlous state of the UK's National Health Service than the patients in its under-funded hospitals were obsessed with the destruction of the state of Israel and the extermination of the Jews, both being the explicit goals of Hamas. .

Corbyn's election and then, a year later, re-election with a larger majority, were all the more remarkable in that well-publicised revelations concerning his numerous and long-standing associations and joint activities with Islamic theocrats, Irish terrorists, Latin American *caudillos*, Jewish conspiracy theorists and Holocaust deniers had not worked to his disadvantage amongst those who cast their votes for him. If anything, they may have operated in the opposite direction. In the Middle East however, his election received, to put it mildly, a mixed reception. Correctly describing Corbyn as a 'leftist MP who has empathised with Hezbollah and Hamas', the *Israeli Times* reported that 'British Jews were alarmed by his ties to Holocaust deniers, terrorists and some outright anti-Semites'. For exactly these same reasons, the *Al-Risalah* Hamas website hailed the new Labour Leader as 'one of the most prominent British figures who voiced solidarity with the Palestinian cause and declared his rejection of the Gaza war'. (but not the rocket attacks, tunnelling and murder of three Jews that provoked it.) A year later, it was revealed that during the course of Corbyn's campaign for the Labour Party leadership he had been sent a cheque for £10,000 by Friends of Al-

Aqsa, an organisation whose leader, Ismail Patel, was known to be in sympathy with Hamas. Corbyn's former Iranian employers, the executioners of Kurds, gays, feminists, leftists, poets, trade unionists and secularists, were likewise predictably delighted with their useful idiot's election victory, with a regime spokesman laughably describing him, with no apparent intended irony, as a 'lifelong peace and human rights activist'. This from the theocracy that rejects the very concept of human rights and promises to 'wipe Israel off the map', and about a 'peace activist' who counted anti-Semitic terrorists among his 'friends' and in the columns of the Stalinist *Morning Star*, concocted pretexts for President Putin's illegal occupations and annexations. Syed Salman Safavi, a political adviser to Iran's Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khamenei, praised Corbyn for his opposition to NATO and his insistence that to 'ensure security [sic] in the Middle East, Hezbollah, Hamas and Iran need to participate in the dialogue [sic] and in the exchange of views.'

Quite aside from his anti-Zionism, it was only to be expected that Corbyn's anti-western stance should earn him plaudits in Moscow. Putin's Ambassador to the UK, Alexander Yakovenko, praised the newly elected Labour leader for his 'opposition to military interventions of the west [those of the Kremlin were another matter], support for the UK's nuclear disarmament [though not Russia's, with its 7,500 nuclear warheads, the world's largest nuclear arsenal, compared with the UK's 215] and conviction [shared by US President Donald Trump] that NATO had outstayed its *raison d'être*.' (Russia's military budget had expanded by 59% between 2012 and 2015)

Shortly after his election Corbyn, attended a state banquet at Buckingham Palace for the visiting Chinese President Xi Jinping where, according to the Guangdong Province-based *South Metropolis Daily*, they had a 'cordial and constructive encounter'. (In 2019, he declined a similar invitation when Trump was the guest, only to then to request a private meeting, which Trump turned down.) This was standard protocol for such meetings and tells us nothing. More informative was the comment by an academic at the Shanghai International Studies University, who ventured the thought that the Chinese President's interest in the Labour Leader could have been aroused by his belief that 'Corbyn's ideas about socialism and the working class are similar to the ideology of our country's ruling party.' Support for this supposition was leant credibility when, in the debate on his Tory opposite number's Autumn Statement, Corbyn's Shadow Chancellor John McDonnell quoted from Chairman Mao's Little Red Book on how to conduct economic policy. Perhaps McDonnell was unaware that in Mao's 'Great Leap Forward' of 1958, the 'Great Helmsman' ordered his serfs to neglect their farms and instead devote their energies to producing in 'people's communes' what inevitably proved to be useless sub-standard steel to accelerate, Stalin fashion, China's industrialisation. The result was a Mao-made famine and 45 million deaths by starvation.

It was not only Mao's economic policies that appealed to McDonnell. Corbyn's Shadow Chancellor also revealed he possibly had a hankering after the way China's despot dealt with his political opponents in his so-called 'Cultural Revolution', when he described a Tory minister as 'a stain on humanity' and asked, 'why aren't we lynching this bastard?' Undoubtedly McDonnell had his own special take on Corbyn's 'kinder politics', at a London Momentum rally, deriding his leader's Parliamentary opponents as 'fucking hopeless', a term he afterwards justified as a 'normal political description'. At the same event, held to

celebrate Corbyn's inclusion on the ballot in the 2016 leadership contest, another speaker, perhaps, like McDonnell striving to establish his proletarian *bona fides*, bellowed 'Blair, fuck you', while a third called those MPs whose resignation from Corbyn's shadow front bench team had triggered the contest, 'lying dishonest leaders with no values', begging the obvious question ...why had Corbyn appointed them in the first place?

Not only McDonnell seemed unable to contain his admiration for China's ultra-Stalinist mass murderer. Back in 2008, when Diane Abbott suggested on a TV political chat show that Mao 'on balance [sic] did better than harm', former Tory politician Michael Portillo challenged her to name 'the good things Mao did that made up for the sixty million people he murdered.' Unperturbed by the death tally, which she did not deny, Abbott stuck to her guns. Resorting to the Stalinist mantra, 'no omelettes without egg shells', she argued in Mao's defence that 'he led his [sic] country from feudalism, he helped to defeat the Japanese, and he left his [sic] country on the verge of the great economic success they are having now.' (The reader will recall that Noam Chomsky made a similar claim for the 'positive side' of the Pol Pot regime, just as Seumas Milne had for Stalin's) Ironically, the 'success' that China's new billionaire elite were enjoying had been achieved by jettisoning the disastrous economic policies pursued by Mao and recommended by McDonnell. Informed viewers must have been left wondering why the overcoming of feudalism, a system dominated by a tiny minority of wealthy landlords, the defeat of Japan, which involved the killing of Japanese soldiers not Chinese civilians, and economic growth, necessitated the premature deaths of around ten per cent of China's population. Mao's foreign policy had been no less, how shall we say, unorthodox, with Peking enjoying, like Corbyn's hero Fidel Castro, the best of diplomatic relations with Franco Spain and, following his quasi-fascist military coup in 1973, President Pinochet of Chile.

Sympathies for totalitarian and terrorist mass murderers extended beyond Corbyn's shadow cabinet.. *Guardian* journalist and Stalin apologist Seumas Milne was inducted into Corbyn's inner circle with the exalted title of 'Director of Strategy and Communications'. He shared his chief's admiration for Hamas, saluting to cheers at an anti-Israel rally its 'spirit of resistance' that 'will not be broken'. But not only for Hamas. In his own version of 'they had it coming', two days after 9/11, he wrote that al-Qaeda's nearly 3,000 civilian victims were 'reaping a dragon's teeth harvest they themselves [sic] sowed', while London's 7/7 was 'driven by world-wide anger at US-led domination and occupation of Muslim countries', the only surprise being that it was 'so long coming'. Milne did not explain why randomly selected airline passengers, New York office workers, fireperson an police officers, and London commuters had to be murdered in order to expiate the guilt of US policy makers. Corbyn's Stop the War Coalition comrade Lindsey German whom, the reader will recall, in the interests of placating the homophobia and misogyny of the Sharia left's Muslim comrades, had advocated the ditching the 'shibboleths' of gay and women's rights and approved of gender segregation at public meetings, had a similar 'take' on the murder of a rabbi and three Jewish school children in Toulouse in March 2012. She began by seeming to agree that 'no one can justify these attacks'; only then to do just that: 'but [there is always a 'but']] the shootings in Toulouse are the terrible and disastrous outcome [not of Islamic anti-Semitism, as one might naively suppose, but] the West's war policies and anti-Muslim racism'. 'Our fault', again.

When German delivered on the Coalition's official website this apologia for what was so clearly an atrocity fuelled, not by opposition to specifically French or more generally, Western foreign policy, but purely by hatred of the Jews, Corbyn was Chairman of the movement that published it.

Given Milne's predilection for the indiscriminate murder of civilians, it is no surprise that like Abbott had for Mao, he found good things to say about Stalin, with his death count of at least 20 million, a total Milne claimed was 'wildly exaggerated' - just like the number of Jews murdered by the Nazis, said his Jihadi comrades. In what amounted to a leftist analogue of Holocaust revisionism, Milne claimed that Stalin's regime was motivated by 'genuine idealism', and 'for all its brutalities [sic], communism in the USSR delivered rapid industrialisation, mass education and job security[sic]'. Yes, there is always plenty of work for slaves. What Milne described as 'genuine idealism' was responsible for three famines, in which at least 15 million died and countless others were driven to eating their own dead children, and a reign of terror that sent millions to their deaths, either by shooting, or starvation and disease in Siberian and Arctic slave camps. As for 'rapid industrialisation', being geared almost totally to Stalin's military requirements, it reduced living standards for all but the Bolshevik elite to levels lower than they had been under the last of the tsars. Milne's apologia for Stalin was no different to nostalgic old Nazis who used to say that 'Hitler built the *Autobahn*, gave everyone a job, and restored Germany self-respect.'

It is worthy of note that as the same time as hack historians in Putin's Russia were rehabilitating Stalin precisely along the lines indicated by Milne., Corbyn was praising Milne as 'a man of immense [sic] intellect and a scholar'. As to his Maoism, one fellow Oxford undergraduate recalls that 'he spent his entire time at Balliol wearing a Mao jacket and talking with a fake Palestinian accent. It was like a performance art, the sort of thing Gilbert and George would do. He launched a string of motions in the Junior Common Room attacking Israel.' What better credentials could there be for the post of Corbyn's 'Director of Strategy and Communications'?

Hard-core Corbynistas such as McDonnell, Murray, Livingstone, Milne and Abbott took in their stride indiscriminate terrorism and the deaths of millions for goals that invariably, whatever their claimed intrinsic worth, always required the suppression of democracy and individual freedom, and invariably inflicted the greatest harm on those they purportedly were intended to benefit. For example, aside from swelling the bank accounts of arms dealers and providing a jet-set life style for the representatives of various terrorist movements, what benefits had anti-Zionism brought to the Arabs of the Middle East? Likewise, the only beneficiaries of more than a century of suffering, sacrifice, famine and terror inflicted on the peoples of Russia since the Bolshevik coup of 1917 were the kleptocratic Putinista clique that spent most of its time on so called yachts the size of battleships, anchored along the coast of the western Mediterranean. It this same clique that Corbyn and his immediate circle saw as a bulwark against the expansion of democracy into the western reaches of Stalin's former empire. As always, double standards were in play. There were occupations and occupations, some good, some bad, just like certain military 'operations'. Should Israel successfully, and with minimum force, defend itself in response to terrorist attacks, as it did in 2014 and 2021, after being bombarded by Hamas rockets, the cry would go up of a Zionist genocide of the Palestinians,

or, as Milne described it, ‘the killing of civilians by Israel on an industrial scale’. But when in October 2016, Putin intensified his killing of Syrians ‘on an industrial scale’ by bombing an aid convoy trying to reach Aleppo, Milne claimed that condemning such actions ‘diverted attention’ from western military operations in the region, which of course Corbyn had repeatedly opposed.

When, in response to the Russian bombing, Labour MP Ann Clwyd proposed protest demonstrations outside the Russian embassy, Stop the War Coalition Deputy Chairman Chris Nineham, in an interview on BBC Radio Four, invoked the Chomsky principle: ‘Our focus is on what our government is doing. If we demonstrate outside the Russian embassy, it wouldn’t make a blind bit of difference to what Putin does, because we are in the west and we are Britain.’ And this is called internationalism! Strange, because such geographical considerations never prevented the Coalition from demonstrating outside the US and Israeli embassies. And for best part of a decade, Grosvenor Square was the scene of a succession of massive protests against the US military involvement in Vietnam. Nineham tortuously tried to explain why his Coalition had not and would not become involved in any anti-Putin protests, nor indeed against the actions, no matter how belligerent, of any non-western state or movement: ‘We were set up as a coalition in response to 9/11 [which the SWP, the Coalition’s main initiators, defended] and in response to the Western, British-supported drive to war back in 2001, and that is our focus’. Nineham concluded his interview with a blunt assertion of Leninist defeatism, that the Coalition’s mobilisation against the threat of a ‘confrontation’ between ‘Russia and the Western powers, including Britain’ means ‘opposing the west’, that is, to take the side of the west’s enemies. (As we have seen, this became the stance adopted by the Coalition in response to Putin’s invasion of Ukraine in 2022.)

Corbyn, we will recall, was a founder in 2001, and then from 2011 Chairman of the avowedly anti-Western, pro-Jihadi Coalition until his election as Leader of the Labour Party in September 2015. At no time during his high-profile involvement with the Coalition did he dissent from its founding principle, enunciated in 2006 by its National Officer, John Reece: ‘Socialists should unconditionally stand with the oppressed against the oppressor, even if the people who run [sic] the oppressed country are undemocratic, and persecute minorities, like Saddam Hussein’. (Emphasis added) How George Orwell would have loved that In the name of ‘standing with the oppressed’ it is quite in order to support even a fascist dictator who waged a genocidal war to subjugate a rebellious ‘minority’, the Kurdish ‘western pawns’. It was from this anti-western and more specifically, anti-Israeli (and anti-Jewish) political milieu that Corbyn emerged to become Leader of the Labour Party. Some might be puzzled as to why Corbyn, a ‘peace campaigner’, had chosen to collaborate over the years with movements and individuals who had waged and advocated a war of terror against Israel, and identify himself with regimes that used murderous violence against their own citizens, as in Syria, Nicaragua, Venezuela and Iran. They also might find strange, given what he declares is his unequivocal commitment to world peace and human rights, Corbyn’s selection of a top team composed largely of supporters of Islamic Jihadism, endorsers of Putin’s expansionist foreign policy, and apologists for Maoist and Stalinist mass murder. And yet there was no mystery here. The already-discussed Chomsky principle, according to which the only legitimate target of protest and political action is one’s own government, was self-evidently

the one that guided Corbyn's foreign and in certain respects, such as defence, his domestic policies. It went like this:

Putin can bomb and assassinate whom he likes, Assad can massacre whom he likes, Jihadis can murder whom they like, the Ayatollahs can hang whom they like, Maduro can rig elections when he likes, the Islamic State can rape, behead, burn and torture whom it likes...they are not our enemies. Indeed, in as much as they help our struggle to undermine western imperialism, they are our allies, even if it is not opportune for a Leader of the Labour Party to say so openly. The enemy, western imperialism, is here, in London, and in Paris and Berlin, and above all in Washington and Jerusalem.

That is why I call Corbyn's 'peace campaigning' 'selective', because in essence, it was simply a mask for defeatism and, in a state of war, potentially treasonous. It had significant antecedents. In the run-up to the Second World War, British pacifists, aristocrats and fascists called for an 'understanding' with Nazi Germany, while in the Cold War that followed it, Stalinist-controlled 'peace movements' specialised in enlisting naïve and dim-witted 'peace campaigners' of the Corbyn brand, 'useful idiots' as Lenin called them, who could then be easily prevailed upon, sometimes after a Potemkin visit to the USSR, and despite Russia having by far the largest military capability in the world, to say nice words about the Kremlin's peaceful intentions, while staging demonstrations at home demanding that the west disarm itself unilaterally. Corbyn, we will recall, had been a member of CND since the age of 15, and more recently, served as its vice President and vice Chair. But this too was *deja vu*. Well into the Second World War, the Peace Pledge Union followed an identical policy, performing the most incredible contortions in condemning the Allied war against the Axis powers as immoral while at the same time, dismissing out of hand accounts of the horrors of Hitler's Reich as Allied war propaganda (see appendix VIII). George Orwell summed up the consequences of their stance rather well: 'Since pacifists have more freedom of action in countries where traces of democracy survive, pacifism can act more effectively against democracy than for it. Objectively, the pacifist is pro-Nazi.' And in the era of the Cold War, pro-Soviet and today, pro-Putin and pro-Jihadi. In 2018, the Anne Frank Trust appointed as its Head a Quaker, Tim Henderson who then, as we have seen, presided over the Trust's infiltration by anti-Semitic, pro-Jihadi Muslims. Today, the Society of Friends, despite its unconditional commitment to non-violence, collaborates in the BDS movement with quite openly anti-Semitic advocates of Jihad against Israel, and if not in so many words, condones acts of terror against the Jewish state, with statements such as, 'before we deplore [Palestinian] terrorism, it is essential to recognise clearly and fully whose "terrorism" came first, so that we can assess what is cause and what is effect.' Yes indeed, because the 'terrorism that came first' was that of the five Arab states that invaded and attempted to obliterate Israel on the very day of its birth, May 14, 1948. The Quaker stance on the Middle East stance was a re-run of its position on the Cold War, when, in 1947, it blamed the USA for Stalin's hostility towards the West.

One of the mobilising forces behind the Corbyn throne was Momentum and its organiser James Schneider. Very free in his condemnation of what he called 'comfortable elite liberals', Schneider was himself just that. The son of a shady

multi-millionaire property tycoon, his irresistible ascent to Oxford, where he studied theology (sic), began with attendance at the elite Oxford Dragon Prep School, followed by spells at two no less exclusive and extremely expensive public, that is to say, private schools, Winchester and St Pauls. (Two other top Corbynista silver spoons, Milne and Murray, followed the same educational path leading from Winchester to Oxford) So much for Schneider's simulated contempt for the 'comfortable elite'. His liberalism (purely nominal, in the light his reputation for inciting Momentum thuggery) flourished briefly while at Oxford, when he became President of the university's Liberal Democratic Society, during the period when the party was in coalition with the Tories. After voting Liberal Democrat at the 2015 General Election, within a matter of weeks Schneider resurfaced as a born-again Corbynite, his previous total lack of any identification with left wing politics proving no obstacle to his subsequent meteoric rise as a high priest of the Corbynista cult. Such men are evidently born to rule. In this new persona, the theology graduate could be seen parading in public sporting a red T shirt emblazoned with the moto 'Jeremy Corbyn for Labour Leader', the all too familiar spectacle of a thoroughly spoilt upper-class playboy savouring the thrill and notoriety of Momentum's *épater la bourgeoisie* style of politics.

Those most zealous in their devotion to (and in some cases, also manipulation of) the Corbynista cult, were recruited from a new breed of leftist-posturing, self-righteous, self-promoting gilded youth, ever-ready to jump on any bandwagon that promised to inject some spice into their hitherto jaded lives. Below them were the foot soldiers of the British wing of the US 'Black Lives Matter' campaign, who when its day was done, took up the cause of trans activism. The main form of protest engaged in (briefly, before they got bored) by its UK chapter was to cause as much disruption as possible to the lives of ordinary people, for example by blocking access to airports in peak holiday periods. Those who tend to find conspiracies lurking around every political corner can on this occasion be forgiven for suspecting that preventing working class families bound for sunnier climes from catching their booked flight was calculated to repel and not attract support for black victims of police violence. But given the protestors social background, should we be surprised at such behaviour? Only those with a profound contempt for the 'masses' they fondly imagine they are destined to liberate could, without any moral qualms, indulge in such conduct.

And sure enough, among the all-white black freedom fighters gracing the London magistrates court in September 2016 on charges of Aggravated Trespass at London's City Airport were the triple-barrelled Natalie Geraldine Twistleton-Wykeham-Fiennes, at 25, still living at her parents' £2 million mansion off Clapham Common (occupation, baby-sitter); Esme Waldron, who described herself as an 'expert on lesbian culture'; Alex Etchart, (occupation, 'youth empowerment' with a degree in 'ethnomusicology' and director of The Sex Workers' Opera); with only two barrels, Sam Lund-Market (occupation, University Environmental Officer) and Debora Francis-Grayson, at 31, still to complete her PhD in 'Media and Communications'. Such pedigree, in the normal run of things, would consign this parasitic crew to the deepest of the dungeons reserved for those cursed by their 'white privilege' But like others of similar provenance, they had at least been sufficiently street-wise to avoid this designation by nailing their family escutcheons to the mast of the latest fashionable cause. I can write the script. 'You say we are rich and white? True.

But in our hearts, we are poor and black. And next week we will all be Muslim women, posing for the cameras in our burkas outside the French embassy.'

Readers will no doubt recall that especially in recent years, the left has with some justice derided the Tory party as one dominated by 'toffs. As one might expect, the EU referendum battle was essentially one between two Bullingdon Club Tories, Cameron of Eaton and Oxford and Johnson, of Eaton and Oxford. But Labour's token pro-Remain campaign was effectively sabotaged by two champagne Corbynistas from the same top drawer, Seumas Milne of Winchester and Oxford and James Schneider of... Winchester and Oxford. And what of the credulous crank who was the UK's Prime Minister-in waiting? As befitted one who throughout his Parliamentary career had shown himself to be incapable of consistent and serious thought about anything of note, Corbyn's main sources of political inspiration had been highly eclectic, ranging from Stalinism and third world dictators to Islamic theocracy and Jihadism. Earlier in his career, when Soviet-style communism still seemed a going concern, Corbyn began writing regularly for the pro-Moscow *Morning Star*, successor to the Communist Party's *Daily Worker*. He is even said to have explored on a motorbike, with Diane Abbott riding pillion, the Kremlin's East German prison as a guest of Brezhnev's puppet jailer Erich Honeker. (This became one of a series of hilarious episodes in *Corbyn the Musical*) Then, with the breeching of the prison's wall and the ensuing spectacular collapse of the entire Soviet bloc, while retaining more than a residual loyalty to post-Soviet Russia, his strongest attachments shifted to the intransigently anti-Western and anti-Zionist Iran of the Ayatollahs, Palestinian Jihadis, and any Latin American regime, no matter how repressive, that displayed the continent's traditional and often well-merited hostility towards the Great Satan in Washington.

Corbyn was not alone in his indifference to the authoritarian practises of the regimes he supported. In 2008, 69 MPs, 65 of them Labour, backed a Parliamentary motion which ignored Cuba's appalling human rights record (including torture) and instead applauded the Castro one-party dictatorship for its 'achievements'. Among those signing along with Corbyn were some of the usual suspects, including former Saddam stooge George Galloway of the Sharia 'Respect', and two of Corbyn's most loyal future shadow ministers, John McDonnell and once again, Diane Abbott. Inevitably, Castro's death in November 2016 found Corbyn heaping the usual effusions of praise on Latin America's longest surviving dictator, the *Lider Maximo* having not only outlasted the military juntas in Chile, Brazil and Argentina but, like the Kim dynasty which has ruled the slave camp that is North Korea since 1945, also ensured that all power remained in his family by abdicating in 2008 in favour of his younger brother Raúl without even the pretence of an election. He inherited a totalitarian regime that held more than 200 political prisoners in its jails, allowed only one party, permitted no free trade unions and ensured that all the media spoke with one voice. None of this troubled Comrade Corbyn, any more than it did the dictator-doting clique who comprised his core leadership team.

Corbyn's hyperbole ran riot: 'Fidel Castro was a massive figure in the history of the whole planet [sic], ever since the revolution of 1959.' Perhaps peace campaigner and CND Vice-President Corbyn was alluding to those days in October 1962 when Castro brought the 'whole planet' to the verge of nuclear war between the USSR and the USA by agreeing to the stationing of Soviet missiles

on Cuban territory...an act of sheer madness. And before elevating Castro to the pantheon, perhaps those mourning him needed reminding that his defiance of the USA not only won him the admiration of the left, but of General Franco, who saw in Castro's regime sweet revenge for Spain's defeat by the hated Yankees in the Cuban war of 1898 and more generally, for displacing Spain as the major power in Latin America.

As for Castro, in his youth, he was an avid reader of the writings of Jose Antonio Primo de Rivera, the founder of Spanish fascism. So, it should hardly be cause for surprise that acting on the principle that the enemy of my enemy is my friend, from the outset, Castro and Franco were on the best of terms. Every January 1, the official anniversary of the seizure of power by the Castro movement in 1959, Franco would send a telegram of greetings to his Cuban counterpart, and, incomprehensible though this must seem to those for whom the Stalin-Hitler pact of 1939 is a closed book, Castro would return the compliment. When Castro's ambassador to Spain, Jose Miro Cardona, first presented himself to the *Caudillo*, at the end of the audience, Franco asked 'How is Fidel doing?' and then with some vehemence added, 'Tell Fidel to give hell to the Americans'. In return, the Franco regime defied pressure from Washington to support the US embargo on trade with Cuba and provided the only air link with western Europe, a solidarity that was publicly acknowledged when Castro declared three days of official mourning on the fascist dictator's death in November 1975, and by the Cuban Communist Party's daily paper, *Granma*, which carried on its front page the tragic news that 'Franco is Dead', and featured a tribute to the butcher who in the Spanish Civil War of 1936 to 1939, secured the aid of the Pope, Hitler and Mussolini to crush the Spanish left and establish a clerical fascist dictatorship. Castro is also on record for praising Franco as 'honourable', a man of 'moral and political stature' for whom he had 'a certain admiration'. For his part, Franco described Castro as 'very intelligent' and 'a great strategist' who had brought Cuba 'needed change'.

Just as Franco defied the western boycott of Cuba, so Castro defied the western left's boycott of Franco Spain. Castro's overtly friendly relations with a regime that had marched to power over the corpses of hundreds of thousands of slaughtered leftists did not find favour with the Spanish government-in-exile, any more than it did with the underground leftist resistance in Spain, just as the Castro regime did not look kindly on the campaign to isolate and weaken the Franco regime when leftists advocated the boycott of Spanish tourism, a growing source of revenue for the country's investment-starved economy. Castro's second in command, Che Guevara, evidently considered himself exempt from this policy, because he was caught on camera strolling round Madrid and at a bull fight, always accompanied by a bodyguard provided by Franco's red-hunting security service.

Also captured on camera, socialising with the Cuban Ambassador to the UK at a Cuba Solidarity trade union garden party in 2016, was 'special guest' Jeremy Corbyn, evidently unconcerned that like Franco Spain, there are no free trade unions, press or elections in one-party Cuba. (In its bogus general elections, the number of candidates, as in Andrew Murray's 'peoples [North] Korea', invariably equals the number of seats.) Another 'special guest' in attendance was John McDonnell, then Corbyn's Shadow Chancellor, one-time Deputy to GLC mayor Ken Livingstone, a former co-editor with Livingstone of the Gadhafi-funded

Labour Herald, and as such, close associate of the soi-disant Trotskyist Gadhafi-funded Workers Revolutionary Party. He surely should have known that following his release from a Mexican jail in 1960 after serving 20 years for the assassination of Leon Trotsky, ‘Hero of the Soviet Union’ Ramon Mercader served Castro as his special adviser and Inspector-General of Cuba’s prisons.

With the semi-retirement and then death of Castro, Corbyn’s Latin exemplar became the Peronist-style President of Venezuela and ally of Putin and Iran, Hugo Chavez who, like his successor, the fraudulently elected Nicolas Maduro, specialised in visiting unprecedented poverty and misery on his people; no mean achievement in a country endowed with the world’s largest oil reserves. Livingstone shared his long-standing collaborator’s admiration for Chavez. In 2006, as Mayor of London, he hosted a special event held in Chavez’s honour at the capital’s City Hall, while on Chavez’s death in 2013, the future leader of the Labour Party posted a tribute to the architect of his nation’s tragedy on his website: ‘Thanks Hugo Chavez for showing that the poor matter and wealth can be shared. He made massive contributions to Venezuela and a very wide world’. His hero, who once famously declared that ‘being rich is bad’, certainly knew how to ‘share the wealth’, albeit unevenly. By plundering his regime’s oil revenues, he was also able to make ‘massive contributions’ to those closest to him, in the first place his daughter (and Ambassador to the United Nations) Maria Gabriela, to the tune of \$4.2 billion, all of it of course invested in foreign banks, just in case. Even this immense sum, filched from a people whose poverty was among the worst in South America, was dwarfed by the \$11.2 billion stashed away in a Swiss bank account by Chavez’s Treasury (sic) Minister Alejandro Andrade. When, in the wake of the Panama tax haven scandal, Corbyn took to task those world figures who had been proven guilty of ‘tax avoidance on an industrial scale’, someone should have reminded him of what his kleptocratic comrades had been up to in the years of their misrule. At the time of the President’s death, the Chavez clan between them owned 17 country estates covering more than 100,000 acres and liquid assets of \$550 million. Sharing the wealth indeed.

Corbyn’s top adviser, ‘Spin Doctor’ Seumas Milne, waxed no less lyrical. Petro-Chavism had ‘redistributed wealth [again!] and power, rejected western neo-liberal orthodoxy [not to speak of western democracy] and challenged imperial domination’...while aligning his country with an expansionist Russia. However, even the effusions of Corbyn and Milne for Chavez were surpassed in their obsequiousness by 9/11 conspiracy film maker ‘hug a Muslim’ (but preferably not one wearing a suicide vest) Michael Moore: ‘Hated by the entrenched classes, Hugo Chavez will live forever in history. My friend [sic], rest finally in a peace long earned.’ Corbyn remained loyal to the Chavista cause in the years after its founder’s death in 2013, being no less indifferent to his successor’s continued violations of human rights. Shortly after Corbyn addressed a London rally in June 2015 praising the Chavista regime for its ‘achievements’, Amnesty International issued a statement condemning its use of forced labour: ‘A new decree establishing that any employee in Venezuela can effectively be made to work in the country’s fields as a way to fight the current food crisis is unlawful and effectively amounts to forced labour.’ Human Rights Watch issued the following indictment of the abuses perpetrated by Corbyn’s Venezuelan comrades:

Under the leadership of President Hugo Chavez and now President Nicolas Maduro, the accumulation of power in the executive branch and erosion of human rights guarantees have enabled the government to intimidate, censor, and prosecute its critics, leading to increasing levels of self-censorship. Leading opposition politicians have been arbitrarily arrested, prosecuted and convicted, and barred from running for office. Police abuse, poor prison conditions, and impunity for security forces when they commit such abuses as arbitrary arrests, beatings, and denial of basis due process remain serious problems. Other concerns include lack of access to basic medicines and supplies - the result of problematic government policies - and continuous harassment of human rights defenders by government officials.

Another report contained descriptions of tortures that resemble those inflicted on opponents of the far-right regime of General Pinochet in Chile:

Detainees testified in court they had suffered physical abuse that could amount to torture, including brutal beatings and electric shock and threats of rape [sic] or murder...Some detainees said they were tortured to coerce into confessing to crimes, and that SEBIN [the Bolivarian, i.e., Venezuelan National Intelligence Service] agents tape-recorded their confessions.

With Corbyn's following to the letter the anti-Western policy of the Stop the War Coalition, which he helped found in 2001 and chaired between 2011 and 2015, and his support for any regime, however despotic and domestically unpopular, which pursued an anti-US agenda, taken together with his exemplary anti-Zionist track record on Israel, there was clear enough evidence for the organised far left that Labour's new leader was one of their own. Leading the pack, as one would expect, were Corbyn's long-term collaborators in his various anti-Zionist enterprises, the Socialist Workers Party. In an official statement, the party 'congratulated Jeremy Corbyn on becoming Labour Party leader', and 'looked forward to continue [sic] to work with [him] and his supporters' in the future.' The *Guardian* was if anything even more enthusiastic. As one would expect, nothing was said about his anti-Zionist agenda, or the unsavoury company that this obsession had led him to keep as a result of his continuous involvement in Sharia left operations during his years as a back-bencher. One contributor heralded his victory in tones and with prose that were unmistakably messianic: 'There was for me something profoundly satisfying, not to say moving, in the victory of the man who came from nowhere, the man who was reviled by the powerful, the rich and the mighty. [But praised in Moscow and Peking, to name but two of several capitals.] It was almost Biblical: the last became first.' Having found his messiah, and been born again, 'within in an hour of his winning, I joined the party.'

'Reviled by the powerful and the rich'? Robin Hood...or even Jesus? Let us not forget that the object of this quasi-religious devotion, one that was already resembling that of a cult, was a politician who has spent a substantial part of his career as an MP adulating and even enjoying the hospitality of Latin American caudillos, Islamic theocrats and well-heeled Muslims terrorists dedicated to the elimination of Israel and the extermination of its Jewish population. While of all the national dailies, the *Guardian* certainly had been the most sympathetic to the Corbyn cause, there was at least one writer on its staff whose intellectual self-respect prevented him from succumbing to the sycophantic hero-worship that was

already emerging around the new Labour leader. Again, the imagery is Biblical, but the picture that emerges is anything but adulatory:

‘The cult of Jeremy Corbyn is truly astonishing...every utterance, however gnomic, is now thought to contain a greater truth. [Shades of *The Life of Brian*] Corbyn disciples now regard the man who would turn up at a political rally at the drop of a pamphlet as a seer...He has become a blank slate on which believer’s project their dreams. His story could equally be a Biblical parable about patience or a (far-fetched) political satire’

The Life of Jeremy perhaps? Sometimes fact is stranger than fancy. In April 2016, a new show hit a London stage, entitled *Jeremy Corbyn: The Musical*, followed even more bizarrely, in November by a Corbynista bid to top the Christmas single chart with ‘JC for PM for Me’, and a riposte from the musical’s cast, ‘You Needed a Hero - You Got Corbyn’.. The lyrics of the Corbynista entry capture perfectly the banality of great leader’s thought processes and the degree of sophistication of his target audience: ‘I’m voting Jeremy C [not Labour be it noted] / I like his ideas / they’re fair and they’re clear / Jezza and me we agree’.

No doubt as a result of his track record as an indefatigable campaigner for any number of Islamic causes, Corbyn’s election as Labour Leader aroused hopes in the ‘Muslim community’ that the party’s policies in its areas of special interest were about to change for the better. Two Muslim commentators effused over Corbyn’s spectacular eruption onto the political scene. The Vice President of the Muslim Association of Britain and Chairman of Corbyn’s local mosque in Finsbury Park (which celebrated the first anniversary of 9/11) saw in Labour’s new leader a ‘humble and wise man’, ‘one of very few politicians who recognises that the government must and needs to engage positively with British Muslims’...code for changing its foreign policy, especially with regard to the Middle East. (While British Jews, so Muslims and the Sharia left claimed, acted as a ‘Zionist lobby’, and therefore should be ignored, Muslims had to be listened to, and their wishes, acted upon.) So, Corbyn, the redeemer of ignored and oppressed Muslims, was both ‘humble and wise’...but also a Titan, one who single-handed had ‘shaken the political landscape of Britain’. Writing in the *Morning Star*, the Stalinist daily that had over the years regularly featured articles by Corbyn, Rabbil Sidkar, a young Muslim leftist, saw the newly-elected leader as a cross between a monk and a Nordic god, ‘a quiet, humble [again] and hugely impressive giant [?] who has set off [sic] like a thunderstorm in the Labour Party’. And ‘the rumbles are reverberating around the [Muslim] community’. They certainly reached the eager ears of the Council for Muslims in Britain, the influential and publicly-funded Muslim pressure group that like the Muslim Association of Britain, maintained close links with the ultra-conservative and theocratic Muslim Brotherhood while at the same time collaborating closely with the Sharia left in a number of anti-Zionist enterprises.

The Corbynite movement not only resembled a religious cult. In some ways, it was also an exotic offshoot of the new celebrity-obsessed culture, since it palpably served to satisfy a craving by the young, reared as they have been on a diet of Big Brother, I’m a Celebrity, X Factor, the Apprentice and other similarly inane TV productions, to become identified in some way with a prominent public figure, preferably one that has the aura of anti-establishment notoriety. And as it evolved,

the cult did indeed merge with the world of pop, with the staging of a series of gigs, promoted as ‘Concerts for Corbyn’ and not, as some noted, for Labour or even Socialism, a Jeremy anthem, the proliferation and marketing of Corbyn kitsch and memorabilia and even an oil painting of the Dear Leader Himself.

In Corbyn we had a celebrity unlike any other; the image if not the reality of a man of destiny, and yet at the same time simple (to be sure), ‘humble’, kindly, honest, sincere, work-a-day, a man who despite his advanced years, had the gift of awakening in the young a sense of adventure, optimism and idealism, a preacher with a dream and a message of hope and deliverance, a visionary who was betrayed, reviled and ridiculed by the Judases within his own party, a latter day Pied Piper, an infallible leader whose policy summersaults and contortions (as for example over Brexit), like those of Hitler and Stalin, either pass unnoticed or were swallowed in one gulp, a seer who had a cure for all ills, not least for those who prefer to avoid the irksome task of thinking for themselves by following a messiah who does their thinking for them. And what thinking! In every respect, Corbyn fitted the bill to perfection. Yet when it came to it, the fates seemed to turn against him. He lost every election he contested under his leadership, whether international, national or local. By September 2019, both his and his party’s ratings had sunk to an all-time low, behind not only the Tories, but the Liberal Democrats and the Brexit Party, and with the Greens not far below. Three months later, he led Labour to its worst General Election defeat since 1935. His party, divided from his first days in office, was torn apart by anti-Semitism scandals, for which his obsessive anti-Zionism had been the main catalyst. (See Appendix T) 100,000 members resigned in less than year. There was dissent even among his hitherto closest collaborators. All this and more meant that he would never become Prime Minister. But to his devotees, that hardly mattered, because he made them feel holy and special.

The Corbynistas, a party, or rather church, within a party, except for their overwhelmingly middle-class composition, were heterogenous in the extreme. First there was the Islamic component. Muslim political activists at local and increasingly at national level were mobilised by Corbyn’s well-publicised track record as a fanatical anti-Zionist. Then there were the re-activated ‘Old Believers’, akin to the Russian sect of that name who refused to accept the Church reforms of Peter Great and took themselves off into the Siberian wilderness. Hailing from the election-losing era of Michael Foot and Tony Benn, Labour’s Old Believers reacted in a similar way to the ‘New Labour’ reforms of Tony Blair, either dropping out of the party altogether, some for pastures Green, or simply lapsing into inactivity. Corbyn, along with a small group of like-minded MPs and seasoned operators, like the former anti-Semitic Labour MP and London Mayor Ken Livingstone, was very much of this generation, but with the crucial difference that he found his new pastures for the most part in the oases of the Middle East. Next, we had the far left. Some were old-guard Stalinists, but the majority were much younger, more aggressive and even thuggish, neo-Trotskyist ‘entryists’ and leftist students, many of them lobotomised by campus political correctness, zealously anti-Zionist to the point of open anti-Semitism, utterly intolerant of any opinion other than their own, and sanctimonious with it. Via the newly-created ‘Momentum’ their aim was to transform the Labour Party into one huge ‘safe space’ where the only ones commanding the platform would be themselves.

Then there were the ‘life-stylers’, mainly metropolitan, female and upper middle class, and although few in number, possessed of considerable clout in the media and academe. (Thus they were able to impose on Corbyn’s replacement, Keir Starmer their agenda of ‘identity’ politics, with its anti-scientific mumbo jumbo about ‘gender’ - ‘women’ with penises and no cervixes.) The irony is that many of the new-wave, far left entryists had looked upon the Blair-era Labour Party as an obstacle on the road to fully blown socialism until Miliband’s ill-considered three-pound membership rule provided them with a golden opportunity to elect as leader a figurehead who could be manipulated to serve their own political objectives. They provided the cadre and muscle of the Corbynista Momentum, whose task it was to take over the local machinery of the Labour Party by flooding the constituencies with new and mainly very naive recruits, for whom Corbyn was akin to the guru of a religious sect. Momentum rallies chanted his name, cultists held aloft home-made banners inscribed ‘Corbyn [not Labour] in, Tories out’, while the saviour’s heretical ‘Blairite’ Labour Party opponents were cast variously in the roles of Judas and Satan, accompanied by audible mutterings of a ‘Zionist Plot’. One constituency party secretary described the tensions that had arisen as result of the Corbynite influx: ‘There are members who have been here for 10, 15, 20 years who think he has to go. Those who have joined in the last year think he walks on water. [Believe it or not, there was an attempt to stage such a miracle at the 2017 Brighton Labour Party conference, only to be frustrated by incoming waves activated by Mossad.] There’s an almost religious-like following and if you criticise him you’re a blasphemer.’ (I have been the recipient of exactly this reaction by someone who was not even a Labour Party member.)

It was indeed as the *Guardian* critic said, all rather Biblical, even explicitly so. In my local paper, one enthusiast breathlessly described her conversion at a gathering conducted in a manner more appropriate to a Billy Graham rally: ‘We went to a meeting and Christian [?] songs were sung with placards saying “Support Jeremy” ...nothing but 1,000 people meeting together to support Jeremy’. ‘Support Jeremy’? But not the Labour Party or socialism. And *Christian* songs? Tread carefully, because Jeremy prefers mosques and declaiming his unbounded respect for a religion whose holy book six times instructs Muslims not to take Christians as friends. Perhaps the location explains why on this occasion hymns were in order and not a call to (Muslim) prayer. Here was a scene set in the chapel land of South Wales, scene of the Christian Revival of 1904-5, not the minarets of Finsbury Park, Bradford or Birmingham. Such converts, and they number tens of thousands, believed that at last, after so many betrayals, they had found the infallible leader, the Chosen One, who would guide them to the promised land of true socialism. Spell bound, his audiences hung on his every banal word, clearly believing that he was capable of performing secular miracles that would painlessly transform Britain almost overnight into a land of plenty for the many, not the few. With regard to foreign policy, as a man of peace (but also as a friend of Jew killing Jihadis) Corbyn had made it very clear that he wished to leave NATO and drastically scale down the UK’s military budget by not upgrading one of the UK’s Trident nuclear submarine fleet. Perhaps he hoped that this would release the revenue required for the funding of his ambitious domestic programme.

Anyone who raised the smallest doubts as to the viability of the Corbyn project was liable to be denounced as ‘Blairite scum’, heckled and jostled at meetings, besieged at their home or their local Labour party offices, accused of involvement in a Zionist plot, and even threatened with rape and death. Like all true believers, nothing could shake their faith. All attacks on the object of their devotion simply served as more proof that he was indeed the chosen one, even though, beginning in the run-up to his election as Labour Leader, irrefutable evidence began to accumulate of the kind of political low-life and decidedly non-socialist company Corbyn had been keeping throughout his Parliamentary career. But no one cared. It was either all lies, or alright. His closest comrades rallied to his defence, no one more enthusiastically than fellow anti-Zionist campaigner, East Germany pillion-rider and anti-white bigot Diane Abbott. (She had opposed the employment of ‘blond, blue-eyed’ Finnish nurses at an East London hospital where most of the patients were non-white. So much for ‘diversity’. Unable to refute that her mentor had consortied with known anti-Semites, Jihadis and Holocaust deniers, since the evidence was irrefutable, she offered the following justification for keeping such company:

Jeremy has been an MP for thirty years. In those thirty years he has done thousands [sic] of meetings, rallies, memorial events ...Now if over those thirty years he has been on a platform with someone who is clear is now [sic] an anti-Semite and a Holocaust denier, whatever it is [sic!]...given the chaotic nature of the liberation movement [what kind of ‘liberation movement’, however chaotic’, is represented by anti-Semites and Holocaust deniers?], that will happen. That doesn’t make Jeremy a fellow traveller with anti-Semitism.’

Yes, it most certainly did, because it ‘happened’ not just once or twice in ‘thirty years’, ‘chaotically’, by chance, but deliberately, consistently and regularly, as the record of these collaborations, many of them videoed, had established. These were no random encounters, but the fruits of a shared cause, the vilification of Israel and the promotion of Jihadi Islam. Corbyn’s leading role over decades in a number of anti-Zionist campaigns led him, by his own free choice, to collaborate on the closest terms with those whom Abbott admitted were both anti-Semites and Holocaust deniers *and known to be so at the time*, not subsequently as Abbott implied. In addition to anti-Semites, high-profile recruits to the Corbynite cause came in a wide variety of shapes and sizes. One who attracted particular media attention was Tom O’Carroll. Like others of his kind, O’Carroll had been politically active for many years, but had only joined the Barrow Constituency branch of the Labour Party after Corbyn’s election as Leader in September 2015. In February 2016, Barrow’s Labour MP demanded that O’Carroll be expelled from the Labour Party, not for his pro-Corbyn views, but for his advocacy of sex with children, having served as Chairman of Paedophile Information Exchange, the pressure group founded in 1974 to campaign for change in the law on under-age sex. In 1981 he was jailed for ‘corrupting public morals’ and again in 2006 for distributing indecent images of children. Such activities and views do not go down well with the average Labour voter, though given the example set by the Prophet Mohammed with his nine-year-old wife Aisha and bearing in mind the sexual preference of hundreds of convicted Muslim paedophiles, in Rotherham, Oxford, Sheffield, Keighley, Aylesbury, Halifax, Rochdale and a score or more

other mainly Labour locations, this may not necessarily be the case with all male Muslim voters.

Next, we had four high ranking Corbynistas, of whom three were MPs, who ran afoul of the standards of public conduct one had a right to expect from a politician. First, Clive Lewis. Standing for the first time as the Labour candidate for Norwich in 2015, he was asked by the *New Statesman* whether he took his victory for granted. He replied that he would only lose if he was ‘caught with [his] pants down behind a goat with Ed Miliband at the other end’. Once elected, he rapidly proved himself one of Corbyn’s loyalist supporters, being one of the 36 MPs who voted for him in the first round of the leadership contest that followed the resignation of Ed Miliband. Once elected, Lewis wasted no time in joining the PLP Labour Friends of Palestine. Could this explain why, despite his lack of Parliamentary experience, Lewis was rewarded with a series of placements in Corbyn’s shadow cabinet, first in the Energy and Climate Change team, then Defence, and finally Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy?

All seemed to be going well until he fell out with Corbyn over the Labour leader’s switch to a ‘hard’ Brexit’. Lewis resigned in February 2017 from the Shadow cabinet, while remaining in most other matters a loyal Corbynista. At the Brighton Labour Party conference of September 2017, Lewis attended a Momentum event, where from the platform, he called out to the actor Sam Swann (not a goat this time) to ‘get on your knees, bitch’. A Labour Party spokesperson said the language used was ‘completely unacceptable and falls far short of the standard expected of Labour MPs.’ Lewis later apologised, and that seemed to be that. But then, two months later, as each day, fresh stories broke about alleged sexual misconduct by male MPs, Lewis was accused of sexually harassing a woman at the same Momentum event, which Lewis denied, saying, ‘it’s not how I roll’. A Labour Party Spokesperson said the complaint was being investigated.

Then there was the sensational case of another anti-Zionist recruit to the Corbyn roster of new MPs, Jared O’Mara, who shared with Lewis what one might describe as a free-wheeling style in matters sexual. Despite twice failing to be elected as a councillor, O’Mara was catapulted into Parliament as Labour MP for Sheffield Hallam in the General Election of June 2017. Momentum activists were mobilised from far and wide to get Jeremy’s man in, although his very non-PC past was an open secret. His loyalty to the Corbynista cause, already proven by his high-profile campaigning against Israel, was quickly rewarded, his meteoritic ascent continuing when he was appointed by Corbyn to represent the PLP on the House of Commons Women (sic) and Equalities (sic) Select Committee, while still pursuing his commitment, now inside as well as outside the House, to the anti-Zionist cause, being briefed by the Hamas-linked Palestinian Return Centre for this purpose. Those citizens of Sheffield Hallam who believed that an MP’s first duty was to represent the interests of their constituents would have been interested to learn that up to the time of his public fall from grace, all three questions asked in the House by O’Mara had concerned Israel, and that a matter of days before Corbyn’s representative on the Women and Equalities Selected Committee was exposed as flagrant misogynist, homophobe and racist, their MP was featured in a photo standing between two officials of the same terrorist-linked organisation. Among the issues they discussed was how to organise opposition to the commemoration the 100th anniversary of the Balfour Declaration.

For all his ‘life-style’ eccentricities, in matters anti-Zionist, O’Mara was decidedly ‘on message’. That is why, one suspects, even though he had known about the charges against O’Mara for a month, Corbyn did all he could to save him, saying it would be a ‘shame’ if he had to resign from the Select Committee, while Baroness ‘whitewash’ Chakrabarti, indulgent, as one would expect on her past form, to a wayward Corbynista, told the BBC, ‘people should be allowed to make mistakes’. All in vain, as the uproar in the media and the House grew to such a pitch that O’Mara jumped before he was - reluctantly - pushed. Two postings captured the MP’s idiosyncratic approach to ‘equality’. One, in the run-up to a football match between England and Spain, went thus: ‘Let’s beat the Dagos’; and another, in an on-line riposte to a Dane: ‘I might be a “ginge” [O’Mara is indeed ginger-haired] but at least I don’t practice bestiality like you Danes! Up yours with brass knobs on, pig shagger.’ Decency forbids citing most of his ‘sexist’ and homophobic ‘mistakes’, which reveal a mind that would be a gross insult to any human waste disposal system to liken to a sewer. Suffice to say, they were hardly the best advertisement for his fitness to serve on the Women and Equality Select Committee. Gareth Arnold, one of his Parliamentary assistants, described O’Mara as ‘the most disgusting morally bankrupt person I have ever had to work with’. On August 23 2019, reports appeared in the media that O’Mara had been arrested by police in connection with another ‘mistake’, fraud.

Hot on the heels of the O’Mara scandal came that of Corbyn’s Shadow Culture Secretary, Kelvin Hopkins. As Parliament buzzed with reports of sexual misbehaviour by Labour and Tory MPS, it was revealed on November 3, 2017, that the Labour Leader had appointed Hopkins to his post despite being aware that serious charges of sexual harassment had been made against him by a party activist. ‘Hard Brexiter’ Hopkins, MP for that hotbed of Islamic Jihadism, Luton, where a Muslim Nazi can be elected as a Labour councillor, was another one of the 36 MPs whose votes enabled Corbyn to enter the contest for the Labour leadership in 2015, and was, like all good Corbynista Parliamentarians, also a member of the Labour Friends of Palestine, the up-market counterpart to the anti-Semitic infested Palestine Solidarity Campaign, more of which anon. (Appendix T) A posting by a zealous Corbynista, working on the assumption that the women who made these accusations were liars, speculated on their possible source and motive: ‘This is another attack. Probably by the establishment, maybe by the Blairite faction and distantly possibly the work of Mossad (given the Israeli aim to stop JC at all costs).’ Thus, the Jewish conspiracy.

In the wake of these three cases, each involving a male MP from the small coterie who can be described as belonging to the Corbyn camp, came that of Corbyn’s former speech writer (sic) and then his communications manager for the shadow cabinet, David Prescott, son of Corbyn enthusiast and one-time Labour Deputy Prime Minister John Prescott. He was suspended after an unspecified complaint was made against him. Although not eligible for membership of the PLP Labour Friends of Palestine, given his two job descriptions, I would say that the odds were very much in favour of his views on Israel coinciding with those of his employer. Poor Jeremy. He did really pick them. Livingstone, Naz(i) Shah, Lewis, O’Mara, Hopkins and Prescott. How many more? As of January 2019, three. Solicitor, Labour Whip and MP for Peterborough Fiona Onasanya, described by Corbyn as ‘this wonderful woman’, and who reportedly aspired to be the UK’s first black woman Prime Minister, was jailed for three months and

barred from the legal profession for perverting the course of justice when she lied to police about a speeding offence, falsely claiming a Russian man was the driver who, as luck would have it, happened to be in his homeland at the time. A devout Christian, she compared her conviction to the sufferings of Jesus on the cross.

Next, Kate Osamor, MP for Edmonton and Corbyn's Shadow International Development Secretary. She lied in a letter to the judge presiding in the trial of her 'beautiful son' Ishmael, a 'person of high integrity' and to boot, a Labour Councillor in Harringay. He was convicted of four charges of possession of illegal drugs with intent to supply. (His other job, on £50,000 per annum, was Parliamentary assistant to his mother.) Interviewed on the doorstep of her £700,000 housing association-funded property by a journalist, she threw a bucket of water over him, told him to 'fuck off' and said 'I should have come down here with a bat and smashed you face in.' Once again, a kinder politics. Kate's mother, Martha, was selected by Corbyn for one of four appointments to the House of Lords as Baroness Osamor, even though in 1990, she had been deselected by the Harringay Labour Party as a councillor, and barred for life from standing for office, after funding intended for community organisations was subject to 'unexplained withdrawals and expenditures' amounting to more than £100,000, some on items of a personal nature. As one would expect of beneficiaries of Corbyn's patronage, both mother and daughter had impeccable anti-Zionist credentials. Martha had spoken up in support of members expelled for anti-Semitism, while her daughter was a prominent advocate of the BDS policy of boycotting Israel. Sex pests, racists, drug-dealers, embezzlers, anti-Semites, nepotists, perjurors, liars...What a wretched crew of chancers! Some would say Corbyn had brought it on himself, since a hankering for the good life and a loathing of Israel are hardly the best credentials for a responsible politician.

However, despite these causalities, Corbyn could take comfort in that at least one staunchly anti-Zionist replacement was on the way up, namely Nasreen Khan, a prospective candidate for the safe Bradford Council seat of (58% Muslim) Little Horton. (Bradford West, remember, was the seat of the fanatically anti-Zionist Labour MP Naz Shah and before her, the no less anti-Zionist Respect's George Galloway.) Like her co-religionist in Luton, Councillor Aysegul Gurbuz, Khan had advertised on-line her hatred of the Jews and admiration for Hitler. In one posting, she complained that teachers in her school were 'brainwashing' pupils into 'thinking that the bad guy was Hitler.' 'What good have the Jews done in the world?', she asked, rhetorically. (Perhaps those who award Nobel Prizes could tell her.) Denying that these opinions made her a Nazi (perhaps because it was the Zionists who were supposed to be the Nazis) Khan revealingly explained 'I am an ordinary[sic] Muslim that had an opinion and put it across. We have worse people than Hitler in the world now...Stop beating a dead horse. The Jews have reaped the reward of playing victim. Enough is enough.' In the hotbed of Muslim Jew-hatred that was Shah's Bradford, also notorious for its convicted Muslim gang rapists, these views, infinitely more suited to membership of a Neo-Nazi party than the pre-Corbyn Labour Party, did not prove an obstacle to Nasreen Khan becoming one of two candidates for the Little Horton seat.

Another interesting recruit to the Corbyn cause was David Carter. He described himself as a 'semi-retired international senior manager with over 15 years of extensive experience throughout the Middle East.' Outraged at what he saw a conspiracy to block the election of Corbyn as leader of the Labour Party,

Carter posted a series of comments that left no doubt as to whom he believed was behind it: ‘I will continue to speak out on the smears and slurs aimed against Jeremy Corbyn from the pro-Israeli Jews’. Other postings made it clear it was not only ‘pro-Israeli Jews’ whom he had in mind: ‘Jewish power has the unique capacity to stop anyone talking about Jewish power.’ And yet here was Carter doing just that. Carter fulminated against the ‘pro-Zionist attack on Jeremy Corbyn’ while ‘washed-up Labour failures [possibly a reference to amongst others, Tony Blair, the only Labour leader to win three successive general elections] snap and bark like a pack of toothless dogs’. Carter claimed that ‘organised Jewry’ was ‘trying to portray Jeremy Corbyn as a kapo at Auschwitz [sic!] in their desperation’. As a Holocaust denier, Carter, amidst this welter of posts exposing the Jewish conspiracy against Corbyn, still found the time to dismiss the Anne Frank dairy as a ‘fraud’, unlike Corbyn, who was so obviously the real anti-Zionist deal.

Around the same time, yet another Holocaust denier, Mathew Kees, crawled out of the same latrine, announcing as he did so, ‘Corbyn is great. Am all for him.’ Kees was also another high-flyer, or so he wanted the world to think, describing himself as a ‘renowned [sic] professional photographer, art teacher and sculptor.’ Like Carter, Kees believed he was the victim of Jewish persecution, complaining that ‘there’s no organisation to protect us from Zionist Supremacists.’ For all Corbyn’s repeated protestations that he was not an anti-Semite, (and his apologists needed to ask themselves why no previous Labour leader had felt obliged to do this) there were many who obviously did not believe him. Some, like Kees and Carter, were themselves anti-Semites, while there were others, both Jew and gentile, including myself, who were not. What is undeniable is that Corbyn attracted the support and adulation of anti-Semites and Neo-Nazis like iron filings to a magnet. Proving the point, we have the intriguing case of Jeremy Corbyn’s elder brother, Piers. Whereas his younger brother, for all the parental investment in his schooling, turned out to be a dunce, one indeed so dim-witted that, as an advocate of homeopathy, believed water possessed (like himself) a selective memory, Piers prospered academically, with a First-Class Honours degree in physics at Imperial College London, and then an MSc. in astrophysics at Queen Mary College London. in 1981. (Amongst those voting with Corbyn junior for parliamentary motions in 2007 and 2010 affirming the magical medicinal properties of pure water were the always faithful Diane Abbott and fellow credulous crackpot, the Tory MP David Tredinnick, who also believed in astrology, and that a full moon can cause internal bleeding. In view of Corbyn’s unrivalled succession of electoral failures and his endorsement of proven quack cures, the Corbynista anthem should have been not ‘Oh Jeremy Corbyn’ but the Jackson Sisters’ ‘I Believe in Miracles’.)

Unlike most scientists with his background who took an interest in the subject, Corbyn senior became an outspoken and much sought-after opponent of the claim that global warming in part at least is caused by human activity, a judgement on his part no better founded than his brother’s belief in the cerebral powers of water. In 1995, Piers founded his own company, Weather Action, specialising in long-term weather forecasting. While his stance on global warming aligned him with large-scale corporations and politicians of the right, who saw proposals to reduce carbon emissions as an anti-capitalist conspiracy, his early political commitment was, like his younger brother’s, to the left, but to Trotskyism rather than Stalinism.

In his student years, he became an activist for the now defunct ‘Pabloite’ International Marxist Group before moving on to the Labour Party in the 1980s. He then left the party in 2002, only to re-join it after his brother’s election as Labour Leader in 2015. Opposed, like his brother, to the EU he was active in the Brexit campaign to leave the EU, while at the same time giving his endorsement, for what it was worth, to Donald’s Trump’s bid for the US Presidency. The reader will legitimately object – what has any of this to do with Jeremy Corbyn? The sins of his brother, such as they are, can no more be visited on Jeremy than can those of his forebears. Correct. But what follows can.

In response to the global protests staged to coincide with the inauguration ceremony of Trump as US President, Piers recycled a tweet from ‘WhiteKnight0011’, who describes himself as a ‘White National Socialist’: ‘They will force Trump in to war. What do you think happened to Hitler? Bilderberg CIA IMF Banker Gangsters’. The tweet endorsed by Piers Corbyn was accompanied by images of two Jews who were alleged to control the world, Lord Jacob Rothschild and the then Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. (As we shall see, the misdeeds of Rothschilds and Netanyahu proliferate on Corbynista websites) Although never disowned by his brother, and in fact on occasion defended by him, (he told the *Sun* in 2016 that ‘*actually we fundamentally agree*’) Corbyn senior has form as an anti-Semite. He has tweeted that 9/11 and ISIS were both the work of the Jews. Now we get to it. When in 2016 the Jewish Labour MP Louise Ellman complained of Corbynista anti-Semitic threats, Piers tweeted: ‘Absurd! JC [Jeremy Corbyn] and all Corbyns are committed anti-Nazis. [Why then recycle Nazi anti-Semitic tweets?] Zionists can’t cope with anyone supporting rights for Palestine’. *To which brother Jeremy tweeted:* ‘He’s not wrong’. In fact it was lie, at least so far as Piers himself was concerned. Regarding Piers’ Nazi re-tweet, Joe Glasman of the Campaign Against Anti-Semitism commented that ‘Jeremy Corbyn’s endorsed his brother’s views last time he alleged there was a Jewish conspiracy. We don’t expect Jeremy will expel him from the party now, after all, re-tweeting Jewish conspiracies is perfectly normal in the Labour Party of today. Maybe he’ll give him a peerage.’

In his role of all-purpose useful idiot, among the high-ranking positions Corbyn held was that of Patron of the Palestine Solidarity Campaign, which several diligent investigations revealed to be inundated with anti-Semites and Neo-Nazis. (See Appendix T) One such in the latter category was Reading PSC activist Tony Gratrex. One of Gratrex’s postings claimed the Jews caused the first and second world wars, and then framed-up the Nazis at the Nuremberg Trials for a Holocaust that never happened. In another, he promoted *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*. On the same website he could be seen, on two separate occasions, posing for the camera next to Corbyn, who was smiling and had his right arm around the Neo-Nazi’s shoulder. Perhaps the most revealing and damning recruit to the Corbyn camp was the notorious Jewish conspiracy theorist, former Ku Klux Klan Grand Wizard David Duke, Hitler admirer, anti-Zionist, Trump supporter and founder of the white supremacist National Association for the Advancement of White People. A small sample of Duke’s prolific racist rantings will have to suffice, but they provide more than a hint of his political pedigree. *Mein Kampf* was ‘the greatest piece of literature of the 20th century’, while its author was ‘one of the great men of history’. And, on a subject very much after Corbyn’s heart, in an interview on Press TV (the same Iranian channel that featured both Livingstone

and Corbyn as highly-paid presenters), the US Congress is ‘totally in the hands of the Zionists. The Zionists control the American government lock, stock and barrel.’ In a radio interview conducted by Duke just after Corbyn had been elected as Labour Leader, Jewish conspiracy theorist James Thring, a guest speaker at an anti-Israel meeting hosted by Corbyn at Westminster in 2014, at the beginning of the interview introduced himself as ‘a long-standing friend’ of the newly-elected Labour Leader, and then described how

...people like Jeremy and me are coming together over the Zionist and Jewish power...he doesn't mention Jewish power actually, but you know, it's obviously behind his mind...I think it's quite clear from people like Jeremy and some of the people he's chosen for his [shadow] cabinet, like John McDonnell and people in the [House of] Lords as well [that] they do know who is really running the country and they are itching both for an opportunity to make it known to the public and to do something about it. [Duke responds]:

We must keep looking for sunshine and I do believe we are going to find sunshine in this world. I think things are opening up.... I know you are a friend of Mr. Corbyn and I knew that you respect his positions on the Middle East. It's a really good kind of evolutionary thing isn't it when people are beginning to recognise Zionist power and ultimately the Jewish establishment power in Britain and in the Western world isn't it?

Further endorsement for Corbyn came when, on August 23, 2018, he vowed to challenge ‘the stranglehold of elite power and billionaire domination over large parts of our media.’ Duke immediately tweeted, ‘he's right you know’. The same day, a video emerged of Corbyn making a speech in 2013 in which he claimed British Zionists (sic) ‘don't understand English irony, adding, without specifying what they were, ‘they needed two lessons [sic], which we [sic] could perhaps help them with.’ In response to this story, another Neo-Nazi, Nick Griffin, who had previously announced that he would vote Labour because of Corbyn’s opposition to UK military action against chemical weapons plants in Syria (President Assad had played host to both himself, three times, and Corbyn) tweeted, ‘Go Jezza! [!!!!] I wonder how many Labour activists the hysterical Zionist media campaign against Corbyn is repelling?’ ‘Griffin also shared with ‘Jezza’ the same warm feelings towards Hezbollah, the Lebanon-based and Syrian and Iranian-sponsored terror organisation dedicated to the elimination of the state of Israel. Corbyn had described the movement, together with Hamas, as his ‘friends’ and featured as a speaker at the terrorist movement’s annual anti-Israel ‘Quds Day’ rallies in London. In return, Corbyn played host at Westminster to a guest speaker from Hezbollah. For his part, in March 2019, Griffin was a member of a far-right EU Parliamentary delegation which met with Hezbollah leaders in Beirut, endorsing a statement that expressed support for Hezbollah’s ‘fight against Israel, terrorism [sic] and imperialism.’ Of Griffin, Corbyn had said, ‘no-one should share a platform with an avowed racist’, even though, according to Diane Abbott and his own admission, he had done this on numerous occasions. So why not the no less anti-Zionist Griffin? Platforms aside, as the above citations prove beyond any doubt, there were policies that the Labour Leader did share with the Holocaust-denying Griffin, not least their abiding hostility to Israel and their solidarity with those bent on destroying it.

Another Holocaust denier and Hitler apologist, the historian David Irving, gave his judgement on Corbyn during an interview with the *Guardian* of January 14, 2017. The fact that the Labour party was ‘tearing itself apart’ with ‘allegations about anti-Semitism’ did not seem to worry him - and why should it have done? Indeed, of its leader, the main cause of this crisis, he said Corbyn ‘seems a very fine man...I’m impressed by him’. This was in marked contrast to Irving’s opinion of the Jews, as expressed in his article entitled *Hitler Lays it on the Line* that he published in his journal *Focal Point*, dated May 31, 1983:

In our political life, the Jews are unquestionably obnoxious. They are methodically poisoning our people. I always used to regard anti-Semitism as inhuman but now my own experiences have converted me into the most fanatical enemy of Jewry...A solution [sic] to the Jewish problem must come. If the problem can be solved by common sense, then so much the better for both parties. If not then there are two possibilities: either a bloody conflict or an Arminianisation. (A reference to the Turkish genocide of more than one million Armenians during the First World War.)

In addition to Duke and Irving, Corbyn’s stance on matters Jewish attracted support from two other far right sources, both in the USA. The Neo-Nazi website, *Daily Stormer* (after the Jew-baiting Nazi weekly *Der Sturmer*) and the white supremacist *Occidental Observer*, announced that they were both backing Corbyn in the general election of June 2017. As *Stormer* publisher Andrew Anglim put it, Corbyn ‘is genuinely against Israel’ and ‘seriously anti-Jew’. Similar sentiments spilled out during the election campaign itself in a giant poster displayed by Momentum in Bristol. On the left was a huge picture of Corbyn, and facing him on the right was an equally large one of Tory PM Theresa May. Hanging from her left ear was a star of David earring and above, in large letters, the word ‘Balfour’, an obvious reference to the Balfour Declaration of November 1917, which stated;

His Majesty’s Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people and will use its best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by the Jews in any other country.

The message of the poster was therefore clear. A vote for the Tories was a vote for the Jews and Israel. A vote for Corbyn was vote against the Jews and Israel, and for the Palestinians. And also against the Balfour Declaration itself, as became evident when Corbyn declined an invitation to attend a dinner celebrating its 100th anniversary in November 2017, a clear signal that he did not recognise the legitimacy of the state of Israel, and one that was understood as such by his Hamas ‘friends’, who issued a statement saying: ‘Corbyn says no to dinner on celebrating the Balfour 100 in UK. UK should apologise and compensate Palestinians.’ Two months previously, Corbyn had also turned down the customary invitation to attend the Labour Friends of Israel reception at the Brighton party conference, claiming he was too busy preparing a speech. This proved to be a lie, as he was seen that same evening whooping it up at the *Daily Mirror*’s annual conference bash. Never before in living memory had a Labour

Leader rejected this invitation. Any Labour Party member conversant with Corbyn's attitude towards Israel and his collaboration with those who sought its destruction and the extermination of its entire Jewish population should surely have asked themselves; was it by accident that Corbyn should have chosen to participate in the launching of an 'Islamophobia Awareness Month' in the same week as supporters of Israel were commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Balfour Declaration? And was it also by chance that of the several organisations that campaign in this area, Corbyn should have chosen to join forces with one which was notorious for its vicious hostility towards Zionism? Sufyan Golam, Executive Officer of the group in question, MEND, (Muslim Engagement and Development) had previously used a sermon in a Manchester mosque to launch into an attack on Tell MAMA, another organisation in the same business of combatting what it regarded as Islamophobia: 'We don't want the Government to fob us off with some phoney thing called Tell MAMA, which has got a pretty much pro-Zionist heading it, or in a very senior capacity, and is making comments we might not agree with when it comes to homosexuality, to be recording Islamophobia.' Corbyn's choice seemed to imply that he agreed.

In addition to deviating from Sharia law in not being homophobic, (the punishment for being gay is death) one of Tell MAMA's besetting sins was that it had sought from and been given advice by the Jewish Community Security Trust...surely the kiss of death. With good reason then, Jennifer Gerber, Director of Labour Friends of Israel told the *Jewish Chronicle* it was 'utterly unacceptable' that Corbyn 'should choose to attend an event organised by a group which has repeatedly peddled myths about the power of the "Israeli lobby" that play into classic anti-Semitic tropes'. This judgment was borne out by an investigation into MEND by the Henry Jackson Society, the cross-partisan 'think tank', which described the group as 'Islamists masquerading as civil libertarians' who 'regularly hosted illiberal, intolerant and extremist Islamist speakers at public events.' Amongst its staff and activists were 'those who have promoted conspiracy theories, anti-Semitism and intolerance of other Muslim minority denominations'. Evidently unconcerned by these unsavoury associations, a former Tory government minister, the Muslim Baroness Warsi and, inevitably, the ubiquitous Jeremy Corbyn, appeared in a promotional video on MEND's Twitter page, proving that as on so many similar previous occasions, anti-Zionism can be thicker than party. This was the kind of company Corbyn preferred to keep, rather than with Jews celebrating the realisation of the Zionist dream.

This was not the first time Corbyn had declined to associate himself with an historic Jewish event. In 2016, he was invited by his opposite number, the leader of the Israeli Labour Party, Isaac Herzog, to visit the Yad Vashem Holocaust Museum in Jerusalem. Herzog had been 'appalled' by Livingstone's claim that the policy of Hitler in 1932 was 'that the Jews should be moved to Israel'. Following Livingstone's suspension, Herzog issued his invitation to Corbyn 'to witness that the last time Jews were forcibly transported it was not to Israel [which, as Livingstone must have known, did not then exist] but to their deaths'. After several weeks' delay, Corbyn declined the invitation, claiming he was too busy, offering to send party General Secretary Ian McNichol or Chairman Tom Watson instead. Too busy? But Corbyn was rarely if ever too busy to front up anti-Zionist rallies alongside his Jihadi 'friends' or take freebies as a guest of Jew-killing terrorists and anti-Semitic despots. It was not too hard to divine the probable real

motive for Corbyn's declining the Israeli Labour Party's invitation. Imagine the reaction of these 'friends' if Comrade Jeremy had been a guest of a Jewish socialist in, of all places, Jerusalem, bearing witness to a crime that in their estimation, either never happened, or if it did, was a cause for celebration?

During his campaign for the Labour leadership, Corbyn, having said he wanted 'a kinder politics', understandably came under considerable pressure to disavow his long-standing associations with anything but kind avowed anti-Semites, Jihadis, Iranian theocrats and Holocaust and 9/11 deniers. Despite equivocations and convenient memory lapses, it became obvious that Corbyn was not prepared to do so. Even when he attended, *pro forma*, a 'fringe' meeting of the Labour Friends of Israel at the September 2015 Labour party conference, in a speech lasting eight minutes on the subject of Israeli-Palestinian relations, he could not bring himself to utter once the word 'Israel', not even when challenged to do so by a member of the audience. Amongst the company Corbyn had kept, Israel was for his Arab Jihadi friends a taboo word, 'Zionist entity' being the standard term for the state that must be destroyed. So, without saying the forbidden word, he still somehow contrived to condemn Israel for its 'siege of Gaza', while having no words of criticism for Hamas's kidnappings, renewed tunnelling and rocket attacks.

For how long Corbyn would be able to continue serving as the Sharia left's useful idiot remained to be seen. Now that he wore Labour's crown, would the former Sharia Prince Hal remain true to his Jihadi John Falstaffs? His pusillanimous response to the Paris massacres of November 13 2015, which earned him the epithet 'fucking disgrace' from a former Labour Minister, suggested that he would. Then in March 2016, a report appeared in the *Daily Telegraph* of his close links with Mohammed Kozbar, Chairman of the Finsbury Park Mosque. This jewel in the crown of UK Islam was opened by its Patron, the then Prince Charles, in 1994 and its construction funded by King Fahd of Saudi Arabia. It was also notorious for its celebration of the first anniversary of 9/11, and as a breeding ground for 'home grown' recruits to the Islamic State. Kozbar, who was on record as calling for the destruction of Israel and had engaged in fund raising for Hamas, was shown at a mosque function in July 2015 shaking hands with Corbyn in front of the logo of the Muslim Brotherhood-affiliated Muslim Association of Britain, together with a Corbyn tweet which read: 'With Mohammed Kozbar at the Finsbury Park Mosque Iftar supper and thanked them for being a superb [sic] community.'

Also pointing in the same direction was Corbyn's appointment of two former associates of the WRP, co-editors of the PLO, Gaddafi and Saddam-subsidised *Labour Herald*: Ken Livingstone, as co-chairman of the Labour Party's defence review, and John McDonnell, back in the 1980s Livingstone's deputy leader of the GLC, as shadow Chancellor of the Exchequer. Both were very public opponents of the existence of the state of Israel. Within hours of his appointment, Livingstone was advising a critic that he 'might need some psychiatric help', just one of many instances of Corbyn's 'kinder politics'. Then in April 2016 came the bombshell and body blow to Corbyn of the suspension of his closest ally on a charge of anti-Semitism. For Livingstone watchers such as myself, it was hardly a surprise, since he had never disguised his venomous hatred of Israel, whose creation he regards as 'a disaster', and of the ideals that created and sustain it, which he had likened to Nazism.

His views on the fate of the Jews in Nazi Germany were likewise coloured by his visceral anti-Zionism, with Livingstone even claiming on Irish state radio in August 1983 that English rule in Ireland had been more destructive than the Holocaust. In the event, the remarks that triggered his suspension were the claim that until his last years, Hitler was a ‘supporter of Zionism’, and another, made in defence of Muslim Labour MP for Bradford West Naz Shah, adviser to Shadow Chancellor John McDonnell. Shah had proposed as a ‘solution [sic] to [the] Israel-Palestine conflict’ that all of Israel’s six million Jews should be, quote, ‘relocated’ to the United States, and on another occasion, had advised readers of her website to ‘never forget’ that ‘everything that Hitler did in Germany was legal’ (See appendix III). Against Corbyn’s wishes, Labour’s National Executive Committee immediately suspended her. Shah was also defended against charges of anti-Semitism by fellow Muslim MP Rupa Huq, who subsequently was accused by a Jewish staffer of anti-Semitism, while Corbyn’s most senior adviser, Seumas Milne, claimed that when Livingstone described Hitler as a supporter of Zionism, he ‘had a point’.

If we combine what Shah, Milne and Livingstone each say about Hitler, what emerges is a picture of a successful, law-abiding German politician who, until, according to Livingstone, he ‘went mad and ended up killing six million Jews’ and therefore, being insane, became no longer legally or morally responsible for his actions, went out of his way to help the Jews realise their dream of returning to the Holy Land. Livingstone would have been well-advised to check his sources before sounding off about Hitler and the Jews. For example, his assertion that Hitler ‘won his [sic] election in 1932’ is wrong. Hitler and his party contested not one, but four national elections in 1932, and in each of them failed to win anything like a majority of the votes cast. The first two were for the post of President. In the first round, on March 13, Hitler secured 30.1% of the votes cast. In the run-off on April 10, when he collected extra votes from voters who had backed right wing candidates eliminated after the first round, Hitler’s share of the vote was 36.8%. The last two were elections to the Reichstag. On July 31, the Nazi Party’s share of the votes was 37.27%, their largest in a free election, and on November 6, 33.09%, less by some margin than the vote for the two left parties, the Communists and the Social Democrats with 37.29%

‘Hitler supported Zionism’? Also, wrong. In his *Mein Kampf* (1925) he predicted that a ‘Jewish state in Palestine’ would serve as a ‘central organisation for their international world swindle’. Supported Zionism? Of the half a million Jews living in Germany at the time of the Nazi take-over, by the outbreak of the war, 252,000, after being stripped of their money and possessions, had been allowed to emigrate. Of that total, only 33,390 finally managed to reach what was at the time the British Mandate. Nearly all the Jews left behind in Germany perished in Hitler’s ‘Final Solution’. As for going mad, wrong yet again. In an exhaustive survey of all the available medical evidence, the Nazi-era specialist Richard Evans concluded that right up to his suicide in a Berlin bunker on April 30, 1945, Hitler, ‘certainly was not mentally ill, not at least in any sense known to medicine or psychiatry.’ But Livingstone, perhaps privy to facts that Evans either had no access to or had overlooked, knew better.

Livingstone, Milne and Shah would no doubt place themselves on the left of the Labour Party. Yet their unorthodox, to say the least, slants on the history of the Third Reich overlapped with two historical schools at other end of the same

political spectrum, both of which have been attacked, and rightly so, as essentially apologists for Hitler. The first is that established by the post-war German historian Ernst Nolte who, while not as categorical in his claims as Shah, argued that most of Hitler's actions were legal, while those that were not were justified by necessity. Further to the right again we have David Irving whom, as we have seen, was rather taken with fellow anti-Semite Jeremy. Although usually identified as belonging to the Holocaust denial camp, he has always insisted this designation is false, and in fact brought a libel action, which he famously lost, in an attempt to prove it. What Irving did say is that in so far as the Jews were persecuted, Hitler, pre-occupied with military matters, did his best to protect them, but 'had the wool pulled over his eyes' by his SS chief Heinrich Himmler, who was bent on their destruction. In Irving's words, Hitler 'was the best friend the Jews ever had', which, assumedly, quoting now Livingstone, would include 'supporting Zionism'.

Predictably, it was Livingstone who sprang to Shah's defence when she was suspended from the Labour Party for anti-Semitism. Although conceding that her comments were 'over the top', he insisted they were not anti-Semitic, only 'offensive'. All Shah's comment amounted to was 'a bit of criticism of Israel and Israel supporters.' And he went further, claiming 'in 47 years I have never heard anyone say anything anti-Semitic'. But then, that depends on one's definition of anti-Semitism. Livingstone had said it was 'not the same things as racism', any more than hating all the Jews of Israel was anti-Semitic, this being not one, but two stages removed from racism. Livingstone had the usual explanation for why he had been targeted as an anti-Semite. There had been 'a well-orchestrated campaign by the Israel [for which read 'Jewish'] lobby to smear anyone who criticises Israel as anti-Semitic'. As we have seen, this 'anyone' included not only Livingstone, who opposed the existence of Israel, but neo-Nazis and Muslim Jihadis, who advocated its obliteration, together with its seven million Jews.

The Socialist Workers Party naturally rushed to the defence of the two traduced anti-Zionists: 'Shah is not anti-Semitic, and neither is Livingstone.' And if judged by the SWP's also somewhat lax standards on this issue, they perhaps had a point. The online *Socialist Worker* of April 29, 2016 explained that 'anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism are not the same thing', and like Livingstone, failed to offer its own definition of anti-Semitism to establish this distinction. Instead, the reader was presented with one of Zionism that is itself anti-Jewish and, as we shall see, is shared by Corbyn: 'Zionism is based on the idea that Jewish people cannot live peacefully alongside non-Jewish people [and how could they 'alongside' anti-Semites such as the tsarist Black Hundreds, the anti-Dreyfusards and the Nazis] and that Israel should be an exclusively Jewish state.'

The ignoramus who wrote this was, like so many other professional anti-Zionists, either obviously unaware of, or chose to ignore the fact that in the 'exclusively Jewish' state of Israel, more than two million Arab citizens lived, not 'alongside', but *in* Israel on equal terms, peacefully, with Israel's seven million Jews. It was not Zionist Jews, but Hamas and Hezbollah, the two terrorist, anti-Semitic movements supported by the SWP, that had refused to live peacefully 'alongside' Israel, who had rejected the 'two-state solution' agreed by Israel and the PLO in Oslo in 1993, choosing instead to seek its destruction and the extermination of its Jewish population. The SWP had never able to cite one single passage from any authoritative Zionist text which expressed in any form the

idea that ‘Jewish people cannot live alongside non-Jewish people’. The founder of modern Zionism, Theodore Herzl, from the beginning, made it clear, over and again, that the opposite was the case, and that the need for a Jewish state was the response to the fact that the rise across Europe of organised anti-Semitism demonstrated that increasing numbers of gentiles *did not want to live peacefully alongside Jews*, a conclusion tragically vindicated by the Nazi Holocaust of the Jews:

We have sincerely tried everywhere to merge with the national communities in which we live, seeking only to preserve the faith of our fathers. [Like many Zionist leaders, Herzl was himself an atheist] It is not permitted us. In vain we are loyal patriots [as indeed was Captain Dreyfus] sometimes super loyal...[yet] in our native lands where we have lived for centuries, we are still decried as aliens.

The Jewish state he envisaged in what was still then Ottoman territory would be ‘founded on the ideas which are the common product of all civilised nations...It would be immoral if we were to exclude anyone, whatever his origin, whatever his descent...our moto must be now and forever; “Man, you are my brother”.’ Numerous other texts from the various stages in the evolution of the Zionist movement both before and after the creation of the state of Israel in 1948 each expressed in different ways the same principle. And there are also texts by anti-Semites that have asserted the contrary, that non-Jews, be they German Nazis or Arab anti-Zionists, cannot and should not live in peace alongside Jews.

Livingstone’s claim that until the last years of the Third Reich, when he supposedly ‘went mad’ and turned against the Jews, Hitler was a ‘supporter of Zionism’, can be construed in one of two ways. For some it can, and indeed has been seen as attempt to whitewash Hitler, to depict the pre-Holocaust dictator in a favourable light, as someone who until in his last years when he lost his sanity, was trying to help the Jews rather than exterminate them. Others will see in Livingstone’s historical fictions confirmation that the Zionists conspired with the Nazis to create a Jewish state in the homeland of the Palestinians. I have good reasons to believe the latter was indeed what Livingstone intended. But this interpretation has its own complications for Muslim admirers of Hitler like Luton Labour councillor Gurbuz, who praised ‘her man’ as the friend, not of the Jews, but of the Palestinians. When he appeared at his hearing on charges of anti-Semitism, Livingstone should surely have been asked, with regard to anti-Semitic comments by party members that had led to their suspension or expulsion: ‘If these statements, all made by Labour Party members, do not in your judgement qualify as anti-Semitic, what does?’

Shah’s was a particularly interesting example of how Muslim anti-Semitism had eaten its way into the very heart of the Labour Party. Herself an adviser to Shadow Chancellor John McDonnell, who was himself an avowed opponent of the existence of a Jewish state in the Middle East, even one, as he put it, no large than, quote, ‘a postage stamp,’ she in turn employed as her Parliamentary aide the anti-Semitic Muslim Bradford Labour Councillor Mohammed Shabbir, who had claimed that Russian Orthodox Jews were involved in ‘the sex trafficking trade’, and that the Jews of Israel were responsible for ‘a Palestinian Holocaust in Gaza’. There are good grounds for suspecting that Shah, who had made similar allegations, agreed with him. What we can sure of is that these

and other similar comments would have raised no eyebrows in Shabbir's heavily Islamised neck of Bradford's woods.

Though united in its hostility toward mainstream 'Blairite' Labour, relations on Labour's far left were not always comradely. Displaying the kind of loathing unique to religious and political factions contesting the same ideological turf, sundry neo-Trotskyist cliques took time out from cursing Zionist Nazis and Blairite traitors to call out and hunt down traitors within their own ranks. One faction singled out for this treatment was the Alliance for Workers Liberty, notorious on the far left for its unorthodox stance on Israel, which it believed should be allowed to exist, its opposition to the Argentinean junta's invasion of the Falklands and to Serbian 'ethnic cleansing' in Bosnia, Kosovo and Croatia. This maverick grouplet of no more than one hundred members, some of whom I knew and respected, was described by one Corbyn loyalist as a 'wrecking operation designed to undermine the political Left in Britain'. But behind the AWL stood even more sinister forces: 'There are well-founded rumours that they receive funds from Israeli lobbyists. They have been planted [sic] in the labour movement to disrupt and divide.' The Jewish Conspiracy strikes yet again, this time in the guise of a neo-Trotskyist sect.

Then there was Momentum, not a leftist sect, but an unstable alliance of sundry far-leftist groupings, student activists and party members of an older vintage going back to the years of the Bennite ascendancy. These substantial, if disparate forces succeeded in bringing under their control a considerable number of Labour Party constituency organisations, and so were able to elect their own delegates to the party's annual national conference, thereby providing majorities for Corbyn's various policy initiatives. However, in the PLP, Corbyn could count on at the most, thirty or so MPs of a total of 232.

Given this divergence, it was inevitable that tensions over Corbyn's foreign policy, for want of a better term, emerged soon after Corbyn's victory. Following a succession of Jihadi atrocities in 2015, beginning with the downing of a Russian passenger jet on October 31, and continuing with the Paris and Beirut massacres of November 13 and a week later, the assault on the Mali Radisson Blu Hotel in Bamako, on November 20, the 15 member United Nations Security Council unanimously adopted a resolution which declared the Islamic State to be 'a global and unprecedented threat to international peace and security' and 'call[ed] upon member states that have the capacity to do so to take all necessary measures on the territory under the control of ISIUL [the Islamic State] in Syria and Iraq'. This was the long overdue blank cheque from the UN for those who could, and wished to, to invade and destroy the Islamic State. If acted upon seriously, as the French, who proposed the motion, appeared to intend, it could have compelled Obama to abandon his disastrous strategy of 'containment'.

Corbyn's opposition to any military action against the Islamic State and, even after the Paris massacre, rejection of armed responses to its assassins in the diaspora, now found him not only in direct conflict with the UN and public opinion, but with most Labour MPs and even with some members of his handpicked Shadow Cabinet, precipitating a series of resignations that lead to a challenge, albeit unsuccessful, to his leadership some months later. And no wonder. What a humiliating spectacle. Within weeks of his election as Labour's Leader, the first test of his much-vaunted internationalism found him refusing to lift a token finger in solidarity with the embattled Socialist government of France.

His pretext was that joining with other European nations in the fight back against the Islamic State would put British servicemen ‘in harm’s way’, as if this was somehow outside their job description, while ‘the loss of civilian lives’ was ‘sadly [sic] almost inevitable’. As indeed it also was when the Allies conducted military operations against Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan in the Second World War. And meantime, as the Islamic State continued to deliberately slaughter civilians by the thousand, Corbyn was advising the USA and France to cease their attacks on the Islamic State and instead ‘put their efforts into a peace process’...presumably with this same Islamic State. With his usual impeccable timing, on the same day that Corbyn declared himself favour of a ‘back channel’ approach to the Islamic State, it was reported from the east Syrian city of Deir-ez Zor that ISIS Jihadis had slaughtered in one day at least 800 of its (‘civilian’) inhabitants and abducted another 400. Yet not military action, but ‘a negotiated settlement’ was the course recommended by this later day Chamberlain to bring such atrocities to an end. A negotiated ‘peace process’ with the Islamic State? Yes, said Corbyn. ‘There has to be some route through somewhere’. But even the gullible and dim-witted Chamberlain realised in the end that appeasement of fascism simply stimulated its appetites.

Of all Labour Leaders, Corbyn’s resembles most closely George Lansbury, who became Leader in 1932, in the year after the defection of Labour’s first Prime Minister, Ramsey MacDonald, to a National Government coalition with the Tories and some Liberals. As an avowed pacifist, Lansbury believed that Britain should set an example to the world by divesting itself of its means of defence: ‘I would close every recruiting station, disband the army and disarm the Air Force. I would abolish the whole dreadful equipment of war and say to the world, “do your worst”’. Which is exactly what Hitler did six years later. At the Labour Party’s annual conference of 1935, held in October on the eve of Mussolini’s invasion of Abyssinia, Lansbury made a speech opposing his own Party Executive’s support for League of Nations sanctions against Fascist Italy for its unprovoked attack on one of the League’s member states. (It was a scenario not unlike that which confronted the UN in March 2022 following Putin’s invasion of one its member states, even to the extent of Corbyn emulating Lansbury by opposing sanctions on Russia and opposing western military aid to the embattled Ukrainians.) Lansbury’s opposition to sanctions on Italy was decisively rebuffed by the trade union leader and, from 1945 to 1951, Labour Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin, who famously derided Lansbury for ‘hawking your conscience from body to body asking to be told what to do with it’. Days afterwards, with the fascist dictators arming themselves for a new world war, Lansbury resigned, and was replaced by Clement Attlee, who returned Labour to a policy of national defence and opposition to Tory appeasement of Hitler. Lansbury however continued in his Corbynesque quest for a world without war by seeking disarmament agreements with dictators who were busily and quite openly preparing to launch another one. In April 1937, he was granted a private audience with Hitler, followed by another with Mussolini. In October 1938, Lansbury, quite logically from his pacifist standpoint, welcomed the Munich agreement that handed over to Hitler the Czech Sudetenland. (Corbyn, again in his role as latter-day Lansbury, without specifically endorsing Putin’s illegal annexation of the Crimea in 2014, depicted it in the Muscovite *Morning Star* as a defensive rection to threats against Russia coming from the West – see Appendix XIV.)

If a pacifist, in a purely private capacity, chooses to proffer his or her cheeks to the first thug that comes along and tries to persuade others to do the same and, in doing so, only puts at risk their own life and liberty, that is their own affair. However, it is an entirely different matter when the same pacifist, but now in a position of political authority, as Lansbury was then, and Corbyn, although he rejects that label, was from 2015 to 2020, seeks to make the same choice on behalf of others by denying to them the means to defend themselves. This was without any doubt the wish of the vast majority of the public in Lansbury's time as Labour Leader, just as it was in Corbyn's. Few, apart from pacifists, Leninists and pro-Jihadi Muslims, will disagree with the proposition that the first duty of any UK government, be it left or right, is to protect the country's territorial integrity, democracy, freedoms and security from attack, whether internally from terrorism, or externally, from conventional military threats. Lansbury did not think so, and rightly paid the political penalty. Neither did Corbyn, but in his case, he was rewarded by being elected twice to the leadership of the Labour Party, ironically with the assistance of some of the present-day successors to Ernest Bevin.

Let us be clear about what was Corbyn's stance on the defence of the UK. When asked at a party leadership hustings by his opponent Owen Smith whether, if required to do so, he would honour Clause Five of the Washington Treaty, which obligates all NATO member states to come to the assistance of any member that is attacked, Corbyn declined to answer. Instead of giving an honest statement of his position, as Lansbury did in refusing to endorse a similar commitment to League of Nations sanctions against Mussolini, he offered a sanctimonious platitude that could also just as easily come from the lips of Lansbury: 'I don't wish to go to war. What I want to do is achieve a world where we don't need to go to war.' No sane and decent person would *wish* to go to war. But wishing is not the issue. There are occasions, as for example when there is a straight choice between submitting to tyranny and resisting it, a sane and freedom-loving person would accept that fighting back, or as Corbyn calls it 'going to war', is the only option. For those who always value 'peace' above all else, war must be avoided at all costs, including those of democracy and freedom.

Pacifists make much of their belief in the 'sanctity of life' and regale those who are not convinced by their arguments with homilies on 'the futility of war', for example the wars that defeated Hitler, put an end to slavery in the USA, removed the fascist Saddam regime in Iraq, and repelled the five Arab armies who invaded Israel at its birth in 1948. The reality is that so long as the entire world's population does not share its absolute rejection of violence, pacifism, far from being a means of preserving life, will more resemble a death cult. No-one has demolished the case for pacifism better than Sam Harris:

While it can seem noble enough when the stakes are low, pacifism is nothing more than a willingness to die, and to let others die, at the pleasure of the world's thugs. It should be enough to note that a single sociopath, armed with nothing more than a knife, could exterminate a city full of pacifists.

'A willingness to die' is exactly what Gandhi recommended to the Jews of Europe as the Nazis herded them into the gas chambers of the Third Reich. A 'general massacre of the Jews' was not only to be preferred to any active

resistance, such as took place at Sobibor and a number of other death camps. Extermination at the hands of the Nazis would be ‘a day of thanksgiving and joy that Jehovah had wrought deliverance of the race even at the hands of the tyrant’. It was in the same spirit that after the fall of France in June 1940, and with the UK faced with the threat of a Nazi invasion, Gandhi chose that very moment to call on the British, *but not the Germans*, to lay down their arms, the same policy that Corbyn advocated consistently throughout his more than four decades of membership of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. His substitute for a defence policy did not impress voters, not least his laughable attempt to appease trade union leaders whose members’ jobs depended on the up-dating of the Trident fleet, by agreeing to spend tax payer’s money on the construction of new nuclear submarines on the condition that they carried no nuclear weapons. So why not go the whole pacifist hog and have guns with no bullets or shells, warships and tanks with no means of propulsion, and planes with no wings?

Who exactly were the Corbynistas, especially those dream-world idealists who rejected the need and right of their country to defend itself, but in many cases, if their online missives were any guide, supported the right of Jihadis to kill civilian Israeli Jews? A 2016 study revealed that of those who evinced an interest in politics, the younger the age group, the higher the value that its cohort placed on extra-parliamentary activities such as protest meetings, ‘flash mobs’, demonstrations, publicity seeking-stunts, and interaction via social media and the like, whereas voting was rated the lowest. As was all too evident from the chants at meetings and the slogans displayed on banners, posters and even T-shirts, their first loyalty, one that was totally uncritical and akin in its naivety and fervour to religious devotion, was to Saint Jeremy, and not the party founded by British trade unionists to provide a political voice for the working class in Parliament. Parliament, a nest of traitors, was not the arena of the real action, but on the street, in a mass meeting or at a pop concert addressed by the Supreme Leader, where the faithful hung on his every (invariably banal) word as if it were gospel, or at a husting where doubters and dissenters were booed, heckled and insulted, and on-line, where traitor MPs could be anonymously bombarded with anti-Semitic slurs and death and even rape threats.

This preference among the young for ‘direct action’, and rejection of what was seen as ‘establishment’ politics had over the decades created a fertile if transitory source of recruitment for the far left. Reared in the elitist tradition of Lenin, popularity with the broader public was always regarded by its cadres as a secondary concern, the prime objective being the creation or, by means of an entry operation such as Momentum, the capture of a political machine. This machine, staffed by a team of disciplined professional political activists, those whom Lenin termed as the ‘vanguard’, would then, at the appropriate moment, and armed with political insights, strategy and tactics beyond the comprehension of the untutored masses, place itself at the head of movements that could be harnessed for the overthrow of the bourgeois order. Such had been the far leftist dream since the Bolshevik coup of November 1917, that what Lenin achieved in semi Asiatic, backward Russia could one day be accomplished in the countries of the advanced, democratic west, guided by an avowedly revolutionary party modelled on Lenin’s Bolsheviks. That remained the case until a connected series of fundamental economic and social changes in western capitalist countries compelled a drastic change in strategy, with one of its consequences being the

emergence and rise of what I have called Sharia leftism. (See Chapter 13) In every variant, the key question was always, how to either confront, or influence, if not control, the Labour Party.

The classic exponents of the entryist version of this strategy were of course the so-called Militant Tendency, the remnants of which, after a series of splits and expulsions from the Labour Party, remerged in their new guise of the Socialist Party under the leadership of the veteran Trotskyist Peter Taaffe. Replying to entirely justified accusations that Momentum was being manipulated, at least in part, by Trotskyist entryists, Taaffe revealed he had already sounded out Corbyn as to the possibility of lifting of the ban imposed on groups such his own, who could then be accepted as individual members of the Labour Party. Corbyn, said Taaffe, was ‘a good bloke. He’s principled. He’s on the left.’ (So were Stalin and Mao.) Taaffe was not the least concerned that the conflict between the Corbynistas and their opponents might lead to a split in the Labour Party: ‘The civil war, now it’s open, cannot be called off.’ He was perfectly sanguine about a Corbynite rump being reduced to as few as 20 MPs. Who needs a majority in Parliament when ‘the lava of revolution was still hot’? That was why ousting the Tories by winning a General Election was the least of the far left’s concerns, as Momentum Chairman Jon Lansman explained: “‘Winning’ is the small bit that matters to political elites who want to keep power to themselves’. The ‘political elites’ in question were those 170 or so anti-Corbyn Labour MP elected by the votes of millions and accountable to their constituents, while the self-selecting elite that owned and controlled Momentum directed a party within a party, complete with a constitution, membership subscriptions, offices and full-time staff, all totally contrary to Labour Party rules and with the approval of its leader. Lansman, together with Corbyn’s Chief of Staff Simon Fletcher, was one of the two directors of the company that legally owned Momentum, ‘Momentum Campaign (Services) Ltd’.

Yet for all the far left’s genuine and undisguised scorn for conventional political activity and established democratic institutions, entryists have been elected as councillors, Labour MPs, and even, briefly and disastrously, as in Liverpool, captured a majority on a Labour Council. For a number of reasons, among them its rich ethnic mix and large and politically active radical middle class, London Labour was especially vulnerable to a leftist take-over, as the Livingstone experience demonstrated. Half of the Corbynised Labour Party membership lived in London. So it was no surprise when, following hard on the heels of the Corbynite putsch, Sadiq Khan, the Muslim Labour MP for Tooting, South London, was adopted as Labour’s candidate for Mayor of London by the Sharia left-dominated London Labour Party. Perhaps the assumption was that as a Muslim, he would be amenable to toeing the Sharia leftist line. If so, it would have been a reasonable, though, as it proved to his credit, false one. He became one of Corbyn’s harshest critics, not least for his refusal to curb the surge of anti-Semitism in the Labour Party that followed his selection as Leader.

After failing in their bid to prevent him addressing the 2017 Labour Party Conference, Momentum delegates took their revenge against Khan by heckling him throughout his speech. A kinder politics. He also did himself no favours with his bigoted fellow Muslims, incurring a death sentence *fatwah* after declaring his support for same-sex marriage, and likewise, also with Corbynistas, by joining the Campaign Against Anti-Semitism, instrumental in launching the EHRC

investigation into Labour Party anti-Semitism. In all, as Mayor of London, Sadiq Khan proved himself an exemplar of how Muslims should conduct themselves in public office. True, there had been times in Khan's legal career when as solicitor, he had become involved in cases and causes that had Jihadist undertones, to say the least. This perhaps explains why, just as was the case with Corbyn, once he became a candidate for London Mayor, his past came under close scrutiny. Unlike with Corbyn, what was revealed was not so much anything detrimental to Khan himself, but rather a glimpse of the Muslim political underworld that swirled around him.

When Khan was first elected to Parliament in 2010, the defeated Liberal candidate, Nasser Butt, was also a Muslim, though as a member of the Amadiyyah sect, not recognised as such by Khan's Sunni Muslim supporters in the constituency. So great was the sectarian hatred directed against Butt (though it must be stressed, disowned and condemned by Khan) that for his safety he was advised not to attend a husting (attended by leading Labour anti-Semite Ken Livingstone) at Khan's local mosque, the Tooting Islamic Centre. When Mark Clarke, the part-Asian Conservative candidate, arrived, he was mistaken for Butt, and, to save him from a lynching, he had to be locked in a room together with his election agent at the rear of the building. Members of the Tooting Islamic Centre's congregation were instructed not to vote for Nasser Butt, since he was deemed to be an apostate, the punishment for which under Sharia law is death. Tooting then became the focal point for a campaign of incitement to murder members of the local Amadiyyah congregation, one which in the very best traditions of Islamic tolerance, included a leaflet in Urdu inviting Sunni Muslims to 'kill a Qadiyani and the doors to heaven will be open to you.' This was in Tooting, London, not Lahore, Pakistan. The Tooting Centre's imam, Shaikh Sulaiman Ghani, notorious for his hatred of the Amadiyyahs, who had shared platforms with Khan on no fewer than nine occasions, tried, unsuccessfully to organise a Muslim boycott of Amadiyyah shopkeepers. He was also billed to share a platform on April 30, 2016 in Dewsbury with other four Muslim speakers and local Labour MP Paula Sherriff, at a Gaza (that is to say, Hamas) fund raising event. Even though it was made clear on its promotional materials that the meeting would be sexually segregated, and ticket applications had to be made separately for men and women, Sherriff only withdrew after protests at her participation in a segregated event.

Why had a Tooting imam agreed to speak with a local Labour MP in support of Hamas in of all places, Dewsbury, a run-down Yorkshire mill town? What possible interest could a Muslim terrorist movement dedicated to annihilating Israel and murdering all its Jews hold for the good citizens of Dewsbury? Let me provide some facts about the town, and then leave it to you, the reader, to decide for yourself what that answer might be. Dewsbury is a small town, population 62,000, but it has, at the latest count, no fewer than 28 mosques, some, including the largest, funded by the Saudi monarchy. The concentration of mainly Sunni Muslims is so dense, in the west of the town more than 50%, that it has been called the Islamic Republic of Dewsbury. In the Savile Town area, the 2011 census revealed that only 4, repeat, four, of its 4033 inhabitants were non-Muslims. So much for 'diversity'. In Dewsbury, the triumph of anti-integrationist multiculturalism had been so complete that even the lady in the Rossi's ice cream van wore a burka to protect herself from being raped by her almost exclusively Muslim schoolboy customers.

In recent years, after decades of obscurity, Dewsbury has repeatedly been in the news, on each occasion for religious reasons. In 2005, the town provided two of the four Muslim suicide bombers who carried out the 7/7 attack on the London transport system. A Dewsbury born and bred Muslim, the 16-year-old Hammad Munshi, brought more fame to the town when he became the UK's youngest convicted terrorist. He was arrested while walking home from school carrying two bags of ball bearings. Dewsbury also holds the record for having reared the UK's youngest ever suicide bomber, Talha Asmil, aged 17, who in June 2015, on an Islamic State mission to murder Shi'a Muslims, blew himself up in Iraq.

Then in March 2016, once sleepy Dewsbury yet again featured in the mainstream media when it was revealed that a local *madrassah*, the Islamic Tarbiyah Academy no less, taught an anti-Semitic, Jihadi curriculum to its 140 Muslim pupils. As in Saudi Arabian schools, amongst its teaching materials were those based on the text so often cited and much revered by the Nazis and Hamas, *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*. ensuring, for such was the intention, that like millions of other young Muslims, the *madrassah*'s brainwashed pupils would grow up believing that they are the victims of a conspiracy by 0.2% of the world's population to subvert a religion followed by 22%. The founder of the 'Academy', Mufti Zabair Dudha, was no small-town preacher. He was the overseer for around half of the UK's Mosques and *madrassahs*. Thus we have yet another Muslimised, run down, former mill town, plagued with so much violent crime it has been called the 'town that dare not speak its name. But it has its brighter side. It boasts an Islamic court, and serves as a kind of Mecca for the UK's faithful.

Back in South London, Tooting's Shaikh Ghani made no attempt to conceal his Jihadi convictions, calling publicly on Muslims to establish an Islamic State in the UK, and depicting women as inferior and therefore necessarily 'subservient' to men. He also, again publicly, denounced attempts by UK security agencies to prevent British Muslims travelling to Syria to fight for the Islamic State. It was no surprise then that when Sadiq Khan's local imam learned the result of the Labour leadership contest, he posted the following message: 'Congratulations to newly elected leader of the Labour Party, Jeremy Corbyn. Brilliant victory. Things can and will change'. And how. A month later, two Muslim youths were arrested after an arson attack on the Tooting Amadiyyah mosque, followed by the murder of Glasgow Amadiyyah shopkeeper by a Sunni Muslim after he tweeted Easter greetings to Christians, and within the Labour Party, by a barrage of anti-Semitic comments by Muslim councillors, Momentum activists, a Labour MP and Corbyn's defence adviser and former London Mayor, Ken Livingstone, each representing the key constituent participants in what was to become the Corbynista hijacking of the Labour Party: the old, Benn era left, the student radicals and entryists, and Muslims, with anti-Zionism, in some cases shading into anti-Semitism, as the common denominator.

Just how firm the grip of the Sharia Left on the upper echelons of the Labour Party had become following the election of Corbyn was highlighted by the way its National Executive Committee handled the case of Gerry Downing. Downing was the leader of a tiny Trotskyist group that went by the name of Socialist Fight. He shared with many others on the Sharia left and in the Arab world the belief that 'the Nazis collaborated with the Zionists in transporting Jews to Palestine' and not, as non-Sharia left history tells it, to death and slave camps in Poland. We have

already seen how, as an integral part of the Sharia left's obsessional campaigning against Israel, a new, totally inverted history of the Second World War was concocted over the years by those who rallied to the Corbynite leadership of the Labour Party, in which Jews were depicted as allies of the Nazis, and the Arabs as their victims (For the true story, see Chapter 6) This Sharia left version of Holocaust denial, as featured in Downing's *Socialist Fight* of October 15, 2014, proved no obstacle to his enrolling in the Labour Party, along with other like-minded anti-Semites, with a view to electing Corbyn as its leader. Nor did his declaration in a TV interview that 9/11 'must never be condemned'. In his case, it took months before the Labour Party's highest body in March 2016 finally enforced its rule that members of rival socialist parties or groups such as Downing's could not be at the same time also members of the Labour Party. However, the NEC initially saw things differently, and only suspended him from membership, a decision which begged the question, since his allegiance and anti-Semitic views were well known, why was he allowed to join in the first place? What was so special about Downing that required the waving of the party's long-standing regulation, Clause II, 5 A? It reads as follows:

Political organisations not affiliated or associated under a national agreement with the party, having their own programme, principles and policy, or distinctive and separate propaganda, or possessing branches in the constituencies, or engaged in the promotion of parliamentary or local government candidates, or having allegiance to any political organisation situated abroad [Hamas and Hezbollah evidently do not qualify as such], shall be ineligible for membership of the party.

Socialist Fight competed with the SWP in being the most virulently anti-Zionist group on the far left, so much so that some of its comments became indistinguishable from Nazi anti-Semitism. It evidently attracted those who share its leader's stance on this issue, because a recruit to Socialist Fight, Ian Donovan, had previously been expelled from the orthodox Leninist Communist Party of Great Britain (not to be confused with the pro-Corbyn Communist of Britain) on a charge of anti-Semitism, specifically for subscribing to a leftist version of the claim, normally only encountered amongst Arabs, other Muslims and Nazis, that there exists a world Jewish conspiracy. It went thus: 'For without the Zionist project, the Jewish-Zionist bourgeoisie, which is a key component of the vanguard of world capital, would have no unifying ethos to hold it together...Without the Zionist project as a unifying force, it would over time dissolve into the various imperialist bourgeoisies.' It was precisely for holding views such as this that he was encouraged to find a more welcoming home in Socialist Fight. Its leader, Gerry Downing, explains: 'I invited Ian Donovan to join Socialist Fight because I studied the dispute he had with the *Weekly Worker* [the CPGB weekly] ...and concluded that Ian was correct...In fact he was taking a very courageous [sic] stand against the liberal Zionism of the soft left in Britain and globally.'

Socialist Fight also ran the SWP close in its support for what the latter called 'militant Islamism': 'We defend the Islamic State in Syria and Iraq against the bombing of US imperialism'. But what could have commended Downing most to his supporters on the Labour Party's NEC was his tweet denouncing the 'glaringly obvious' 'role the Zionists [for which read 'Jews'] have played in the attempted witch hunt against Jeremy Corbyn's leadership campaign.' In addition to

smuggling open anti-Semites into the Labour Party, Momentumistas proved adept at hounding those Labour MP's who did not toe the anti-Zionist line of their leader, especially if the MP happened to be Jewish. Such was the case in the Liverpool Riverside Constituency Labour Party, where a Corbynite claque week after week disrupted normal Party business by demanding that the sitting MP, the Jewish Louise Ellman, declare her attitude towards the state of Israel. On at least three occasions, these sessions involved open anti-Semitic abuse, one local councillor describing the atmosphere generated by the attacks as 'intimidating and hostile'.

Momentum activist Vicky Kirby, former Parliamentary candidate for Woking and Vice Chairperson of its Constituency Labour Party was suspended (only suspended!) *and then re-admitted* to the party after tweeting: 'Hitler was a Zionist God' (shades of Livingstone). Other offerings included 'What do you know abt Jews? They've got big noses and support the Spurs' and 'I will never forget and I will make sure my kids teach their children how evil Israel is', and yet another, that Jews 'slaughter the oppressed'. I repeat: she was restored to full party membership. When members demanded her expulsion, Corbyn's office came to her rescue, saying that any further action would be taken only on the basis of 'new evidence'. Given that the evidence cited here did not constitute any kind of proof for Corbyn of anti-Semitism, it is difficult to conceive what this 'new evidence' would have had to consist of to warrant her expulsion. Another prominent Corbynista, Jacqueline Walker, Vice Chairperson of the Momentum National Steering Committee, weighed in with the accusation that the Jews 'were the chief financiers of the sugar and slave trade' and demanded that the Jews should make amends for their 'contribution to the African Holocaust'. But not Christians and Muslims, who were its real perpetrators. Briefly suspended, as with others of a like mind, she was then restored to full membership.

No such kid glove treatment was afforded *Sunday Times* journalist Rod Liddle, a Labour Party member of some thirty-seven years standing, who was expelled for having the courage to say what everyone knew to be true, that 'anti-Semitism is visceral for many Muslims'. Yet what he said, or rather wrote on his blog, was no different from what the Shi'a Muslim Mehdi Hasan, the biographer of former Jewish Labour leader Ed Miliband, said in the leftist *New Statesman* three years previously, that anti-Semitism was 'our dirty little secret', 'routine and commonplace'. Following his initial suspension, (on grounds that were not made public) Liddle remained unrepentant. Speculating on the probable motives for the action, he wrote on his blog: 'Perhaps it is my suggestion that many Muslims are not favourably inclined towards the Jews', a reasonable deduction from the well-established fact that many high-ranking Muslims had quite openly either denied the Holocaust or proclaimed their admiration for Hitler, including elected office holding members of the Labour Party. Liddle also thought the same of his no less well-founded prediction that 'if the Palestinians were given Israel', as was indeed proposed by Muslim Labour MP Naz Shah, after the 'relocation' of its six million Jews to the USA, 'they would turn it very quickly into a Somalia' He could have added, just as the PLO did to Beirut. Such home truths, Liddle believed, had evidently enraged Labour's 'new commissars'. Speculating on his forthcoming Kafkaesque trial on as yet unspecified charges (I suggest 'Excessive zeal and honesty in combatting anti-Semitism') Liddle commented, ironically, 'I see this as an opportunity and also a chance to apologise for having dared to suggest that any

Muslim anywhere could ever be accused of anti-Semitism, and to insist that my reference to Somalia was a dreadful mistake, for which I am terribly, grovelling sorry - I meant they could turn it into a Switzerland. I sometimes get countries beginning with 'S' confused.'

Liddle shared my belief, for which there is ample evidence, that anti-Semitism was, as he put it, 'endemic within two sections of the Labour Party, the perpetually adolescent white middle class lefties and the Muslims - the latter of whom now comprise a significant proportion of Labour activists and voters in parts of London and the dilapidated former mill towns of West Yorkshire and East Lancashire. And Luton. And parts of the Midlands.' Spot on. Cases such as those described above...and there are many others similar...invite the suspicion that it was the election of the anti-Zionist patriarch Corbyn as Labour leader, and with it, the combined impact of the arrival in the party of several thousand fanatical Sharia leftists, together with its Islamisation in areas of dense Muslim diaspora settlement, that triggered an outpouring of public Jew-hatred not experienced in the UK since the pre-war heyday of Sir Oswald Mosley's Black Shirted British Union of Fascists. Incidentally, his admirers were still in business, with Robert Edwards lending his voice to the anti-Israel chorus of Muslims and Sharia leftists with his accusation of Zionist genocide in issue number 17 of his *European Socialist [sic] Action* of 2008; that 'in Israel's "War of Independence", entire villages of innocent Palestinians were slaughtered without mercy.' Ignoring the fact that it was the combined armies of five Arab countries that had invaded the newly-born state to slaughter its outnumbered and poorly-armed Jews, Edwards described the embattled Jews as 'psychopaths' who had waged 'cold blooded campaigns against the Palestinian people' and, recycling on the far right another charge promoted by the Sharia left, complained that Jews 'to this day use the same moral blackmail of "anti-Semitism" against those who dare criticise this criminal behaviour'.

The toleration within Labour of a similarly virulent anti-Semitism following the election of the party's new leader could partly have been put down to the fact that Corbyn and those closest to him had for years mixed in company where such comments were regarded as perfectly normal and justified. One such was Kahdim Hussain, former Labour Mayor of Bradford (again, Shah's patch) and then a Bradford Labour Councillor, who endorsed a Facebook posting praising Hitler for killing 'six million Zionists', a Holocaust that was distinctly at odds with another Muslim version that was also, it would seem, favoured by Downing and other leftist anti-Semites, the one that had nameless Nazis (not Hitler) killing a far smaller number of non-Zionists Jews and allowing (or in Downing's version, actually 'transporting') the remainder to emigrate to an as yet non-existent Israel. But however wildly the fantasies may have varied or even contradicted each other, the bigotry was constant. Coherence and evidence however were never anti-Semitism's strong point, and so it also proved with Muslim and Sharia left evaluations of the Islamic State. While the Kensington Labour Councillor and 'Big Brother' contestant, the Muslim Beinazir Lasharie, was suspended (only suspended) in October 2015 for posting a video entitled 'ISIS: 'Israeli Secret Intelligence Service', and adding her own comment that 'many people [also] know who was behind 9/11', John Tummon, formerly of Ken Loach's anti-Zionist 'Socialist Unity' but then, like Loach, a Corbynite Labour Party member, continued to advertise his support for the Islamic State (one with a 'progressive

potential') as a necessary factor in achieving an 'overarching settlement in the northern Middle East'.

Predictably, the claim, first made by the Palestinian Authority, that Israel Intelligence had mastermind the 2016 Brussels massacre (See Appendix Y) quickly went the rounds on Labour's Corbynite left. Bob Campbell assured fellow party members that Mossad 'runs ISIS and was behind the Brussels bombings', an accusation endorsed by John MacAuliffe, who claimed it was 'a fact' that 'all countries back rebel and terror groups all the time'. Following the Corbynista influx, comments such as these became quite routine on Labour's left. (See Appendix T) Then there was the case of Luciana Berger, a Jewish Labour MP for Liverpool Wavertree. Despite being (briefly) a member of Corbyn's shadow cabinet, she was designated as 'hostile' to the Labour leader in a list produced by Corbynite loyalists. Opponents of Corbyn claimed this evaluation was motivated by anti-Semitism. True or not, there was no doubt that such was the case when she received anti-Semitic hate mail, including a photo of herself with the star of David superimposed on her forehead.

In areas where Labour was partly dependent on the Muslim vote to secure the election of its candidates, in some cases the result had been the conversion of the party from a movement performing its original role of representing the interests of working people, irrespective of creed or race, to one that pandered to the ambitions and anti-Semitic prejudices of those who claimed to speak for 'the Muslim community'. The classic case was Luton, where Jihadi Islam was so deeply rooted inside the local Labour Party that it secured the election to the town's council of an avowed anti-Semite and admirer of Adolf Hitler. Aysegal Gurbuz was a busy young lady. As a student at Warwick University, she served on its Friends of Palestine Society, while back in her home town, and aged only 20, she had already been elected as a Labour councillor for Luton's High Town Ward and appointed a member of the panel that supervised the Bedford Police Authority.

Since Islam holds that women are endowed with intellects inferior to those of men, and given not only her gender but her age, one naturally suspects that Gurbuz owed her extraordinary rise to the men who dominate the affairs of Luton's Muslim 'community', and would therefore be beholden to them rather than those she was elected to represent. In the main body of this work, evidence was provided that at least one leading and, by gullible *kuffars*, respected Luton cleric held and indeed publicly proclaimed his belief in a World Jewish Conspiracy. Councillor Gurbuz went one step further by praising the politician who dedicated his life to combatting it. On her twitter account, she announced to anyone who might have read it that not Mohammed, but 'my man Hitler' was 'the greatest man in history', possibly because Hitler killed far more Jews than the founder of her religion. Unlike many other anti-Semites, Councillor Gurbuz did not subscribe to the belief that the Nazis were the architects of Israel. On the contrary, 'If it wasn't for my man [sic] Hitler, these Jews would have wiped Palestine years ago.' She also expressed the hope that Iran would use nuclear weapons to honour its Supreme Leader's pledge to 'wipe Israel off the map'. Another posting said, 'Jews can't expect us to sympathise with their history under Hitler'. A tweet before the 2015 General Election seemed to imply that a Tory victory was to be welcomed, because 'Ed Miliband is Jewish. He will never become Prime Minister.' A substantial number of her co-religionists must have

agreed, because at that election, the Conservatives secured their highest-ever Muslim vote, and Labour its lowest. Traditional Labour Party members with an awareness of their movement's past must surely have been asking themselves: how did it come about that someone selected and then elected to hold office on behalf of the Labour Party publicly revealed herself to be an admirer of the head of a regime that not only exterminated six million Jews, but of one that destroyed the most powerful workers movement in history, and was directly responsible for the imprisonment, torture and murder of countless thousands of its most dedicated and courageous militants? The answer was that like so many other Muslim Labour Party members, her prime allegiance lay elsewhere than in the secular world and its labour movements. Hers was to a religion. Nobody in her local party or her Arab friends at Warwick University, a hot bed of anti-Zionism, appeared to have been troubled by her views on the Jews and the Nazis. Hers was after all a milieu in which such attitudes were a commonplace. It was only when here Nazi sympathies were detected by the Campaign Against Anti-Semitism and reported to the relevant authorities was any action taken. In April 2016, High Town Ward's Hitler-loving councillor was suspended from her Labour Party membership... suspended but not summarily expelled. What then did it take to be expelled? After initially implausibly claiming that the tweets were her sister's, (the *Koran* in Chapter 3, Verse 28, sanctions lying to *kuffars*, this being the tactic of *taqiyya*) she admitted they were hers and resigned.

She was very far from being the only Muslim councillor to advertise such views. Salim Mulla, Mayor then a councillor of Blackburn, felt compelled to post on Facebook that 'Zionist Jews are disgrace to humanity' and that ISIS was a Jewish creation. Nottingham Councillor Llyas Aziz, in addition to endorsing Shah's call for what should properly be called her 'final solution of the Israeli Question', could not resist adding for good measure that the Jews of Israel were behaving like Nazis in their treatment of the Palestinians. This comment was then in its turn endorsed by yet another Muslim Labour Councillor, Khadim Hussain. A former Lord Mayor of Bradford (yet again), Hussain claimed that 'your [sic] education system only tells you about Anne Frank and the six million Zionists [sic] that were killed by Hitler, and nothing about the millions killed in Africa.' Whoever these' millions' might have been, we can be he was not referring to victims of the Muslim slave trade. Finally, in this small selection of Jew-baiting Labour Muslims (See Appendix T for more), we have Newport Councillor Miqdad al-Nuaimi, first suspended and then re-instated after tweeting that the Jews of Israel have 'the same arrogant mentality as the Nazis'. These Muslims quite openly conducted themselves as if they were elected to office to wage a theologically-inspired vendetta against the Jews, and not to represent all their constituents, irrespective of their political and, if any, religious allegiances.

A possible clue as to why, during Corbyn's term as Labour Leader, certain party members, especially Muslims, were licensed to say things about Jews that hitherto would have resulted in their immediate expulsion, was provided when, in May 2016, a matter days before council, regional and mayoral elections, potential Labour voters were confronted by the spectacle of the suspended (for anti-Semitism) Livingstone trying to persuade TV interviewer Andrew Neil that anti-Semitism was 'not exactly the same thing as racism'. This was a judgement shared by Corbynista MP Naz Shah for Bradford (again) West who, following her suspension for on-line comments on the Jews, confessed she 'didn't get [sic] anti-

Semitism as racism'. In her case, understandably, because as one Muslim has publicly admitted, in the 'Islamic community', the 'dirty little secret' of Jew-hatred is the norm. When Labour's anti-Semitism crisis became compounded by a challenge to Corbyn's leadership by Owen Smith in the summer of 2016, so the more was it attributed by vigilant Corbynistas to the machinations of Zionists. A prominent critic of Corbyn and member of Labour Friends of Israel, the Jewish MP Margaret Hodge, was accused by the anti-Zionist website *Electronic Intifada* of 'launch[ing] a coup against Labour Party leader Jeremy Corbyn' whom, the item hastened to add, 'supports boycotts of Israel'. What it called 'Labour's fake anti-Semitism crisis' had been 'almost entirely manufactured and was based from the outset on fabricated and exaggerated claims of anti-Semitism that were deliberately aimed at smearing Corbyn, the left, and the Palestinian solidarity movement in general.' This was echoing what Corbyn had already said on the same subject: 'There is no [anti-Semitism] crisis. A very small number of cases that have been brought to our attention have been dealt with swiftly and immediately'...yet another Corbyn lie, as I have demonstrated. Livingstone, perhaps forgetting that it was his claim that 'Hitler supported Zionism' which triggered the affair, implied that the Jewish issue had been manufactured by anti-Corbyn MPs to lose Labour support at the polls: 'You've had smear after smear against Jeremy. The anti-Semitism stuff [sic!] damaged us with the local elections, but not enough to trigger a leadership challenge then.'

With their leader's grip on the party supposedly threatened by Zionist plottings, Corbyn's street army rose to the challenge. As his support amongst Labour MPs shrank, outside Westminster, in Il Piazza Del Parlamento, Corbyn rallied his enraged *squadristas*, some sporting on their red T shirts the snappy logo 'Eradicate the Right-Wing Blairite Vermin'. His audience, partly composed of SWP Brexiteers, demonstrated their loyalty to the beleaguered *Duce* with rhythmic chants of 'Corbyn, Corbyn, Corbyn', interspersed with 'Blairite scum' and 'Blairites out', while holding aloft North Korean-style placards bearing portraits of the Dear Leader. Around the UK, constituency Party offices were besieged, one having a brick thrown through a window. Anti-Corbyn MPs were bombarded with death and even rape threats to themselves and their families, with some requiring police protection. The level of intimidation was such that even the party's Corbynista-dominated NEC found it necessary to suspend all local party meetings until voting for leader had been completed. And of course, anti-Semitism was never far away. The leftist but pro-Israel shadow cabinet member Jess Phillips revealed in her resignation letter to Corbyn that 'writing or saying anything against you risks my job, the livelihood of family. The threats are rolling in.' Among her other crimes, her letter said, was that of being...yes, but of course, a 'Zionist plotter', bought, she later told a meeting of Labour MPs, by 'Zionist money'. One of Corbyn's most vocal trade union supporters, Len McClusky, claimed in a TV interview that Momentum had nothing to do with such incidents. It was the work of intelligence agents posing as Corbynites: 'Do you believe for one moment that the security forces are not involved in dark practices?... Do you think there's not all kinds of right wingers who are not able to disguise themselves and stir up trouble? I find that amazing if people think that isn't happening.' Whether it was Mossad or MI5, the consensus was that opposition to Corbyn had to be a conspiracy, not one motivated by genuine and sincere disagreement with his policies and his fitness to lead the party.

Corbyn's campaign in the Labour leadership contest had been dogged from its first days by a succession of damning (at least for some) revelations concerning his many and long-standing associations with avowed anti-Semites, so it was only to be expected that the 'Jewish question' would again loom large in the dramatic events unfolding in his bid for survival. On June 30, 2016, one week after the Brexit referendum, at the meeting where Corbyn launched the Labour Party's report on its internal inquiry into anti-Semitism, copies of a leaflet were circulated claiming the accusations of anti-Semitism within the Labour Party were 'unfounded' and therefore the inquiry and report were 'unnecessary'. Very much in the same spirit, and evidently unable even on such an occasion to resist an opportunity to attack Zionism, in introducing the report, Corbyn drew a direct parallel between Israel and the Islamic State: 'Our Jewish friends [sic...closet anti-Semites habitually boast of having 'Jewish friends']] are no more responsible for the actions of Israel or the Netanyahu government than our Muslim friends are for those of various self-styled Islamic states.' While there are 57 states, if we include the Palestinian Authority, that have Islam as their official religion, there is only one that called itself the Islamic State. And surely, he could not have been referring to his former employer, the Islamic Republic of Iran.

The fallout following these comments was immediate and for Corbyn, should have been devastating. UK Chief Rabbi Ephraim Mervis said Corbyn's comments 'however they were intended, were themselves offensive', while his predecessor, Jonathan Sacks, was less charitable, describing them as

a demonization of the highest order, an outrage. That this occurred at the launch of the report into the Labour Party's recent troubles with anti-Semitism shows how deep the sickness is in parts of left-wing British politics today. Israel is a democratic state. The Islamic State is a terrorist entity. In the current political climate, this is all the more shocking.

Two other Rabbis, one ultra-Orthodox, (and also a Labour Party member) and one Liberal, weighed in with similar highly critical comments, the gist being that Corbyn himself was afflicted by the same prejudices that the report was supposedly designed to combat. Avrohom Pinter, the Labour Rabbi, pointed out, 'one can disagree with the policies of the Israeli government, but to compare the democratically elected representatives of a sovereign state to a terrorist state which beheads people is totally unacceptable.'

The same fallout struck much closer to home when after only a few hours in office, Corbyn's newly-appointed Jewish Shadow Minister for Europe, Fabian Hammond, resigned, citing his leader's lamentable performance at the report launch. Within minutes of the incident, Corbyn had been reported to Labour's Compliance Unit for a possible breech of his own party's newly-adopted rules on anti-Semitism. The event sunk yet deeper into anti-Semitic slime when the *Guardian* journalist Marc Wadsworth of 'Momentum Black Connexions'(sic), was filmed accosting a Jewish Labour MP, Ruth Smeeth. He refused to hand her a press release calling for the deselection of anti-Corbyn MPs (including Smeeth herself), accused her of involvement in a 'media conspiracy' and then ostentatiously made a note of her name, which he presumably already knew. Wadsworth then rounded off his performance by bellowing to his fellow journalists 'how white you all are', evidently a demonstration of 'black truth'

exposing ‘white privilege’. Smeeth left the meeting in tears. Corbyn saw the incident and not only failed to intervene but was videoed later shaking hands and chatting with his Momentum comrade. The following recorded exchange took place: Wadsworth: ‘I outed Smeeth, bloody talking to the Torygraph this morning.’ Corbyn: ‘I sent you a text about it.’ The incident had apparently been pre-arranged. The leaflet in question described the 172 MP’s who voted no-confidence in Corbyn as ‘traitors’ and endorsed Livingstone’s call for their deselection as candidates at the next general election. And yet from all this, Corbyn emerged unscathed, at least as far as most Labour members were concerned, because two months later, they voted him back as Leader with 62% of the vote, nine per cent more than in his victory over Andy Burnham in 2015.

As for the report, while it spoke vaguely of a ‘toxic atmosphere’, it deployed the classic device of the straw man, fatuously insisting that the party was not ‘overrun by anti-Semitism’. But nobody had claimed it was. Much worse, not only did the report fail to provide a working definition of anti-Semitism, nowhere in its 41 pages did it find room to cite so much as a single instance of the many cases of anti-Semitic statements made by Labour Party members (I cite more than a hundred in this work, see especially Appendix T), and to reveal the identity of those who made them. Here was an opportunity to show that the Labour Party meant business when it talked of combatting anti-Semitism. But instead, there was total silence on statements and activities that had been the subject of national media comment and criticism from the first weeks of Corbyn’s 2015 leadership bid. Typical of the report’s several toothless recommendations was one that proposed that anti-Semitism could be dealt with by sanctions other than suspension or expulsion. As many expected, given that the guilty parties were either Muslims, supporters of Corbyn, or both, the inquiry had produced a report that was little more than a whitewash. Its failings were summed up by Jonathan Sacerdoti, Communications Officer of the Campaign Against Anti-Semitism:

It did not examine the disgraceful cases of anti-Semitism in the party [such as, for example, ‘Hitler is my man’ and ‘relocate Israel to the United States’ to name but two of many] or even more disgraceful handling by the party leadership, including Jeremy Corbyn, who presides over a regime of the lightest slaps on wrists for the most deliberate and offensive anti-Semites. Inexcusably, the report proposes making it harder to suspend anti-Semites and keeping suspensions secret so as not to affect elections.

In a well-merited thrust at the company kept over the years by Corbyn, Sacerdoti drew attention to the report’s rejection of ‘any claims of anti-Semitism arising from sharing a platform with anti-Semites’, and its suggestion that ‘any anti-Semitic incident coming to light after two years should not be considered, a limitation period so short it has no parallel in any other disciplinary regime that we are aware of.’ The report read as if Corbyn had drafted it himself, to protect himself. Having just experienced at first hand a sample of the Momentum Jew-baiting the report was designed to cover up, Ruth Smeeth issued a statement:

I call on Jeremy Corbyn to resign immediately and make way for somebody with the backbone to confront racism and anti-Semitism in our party and in the country...Until today I had made no public comment about Jeremy’s ability to lead

our party, but the fact that he failed to intervene is final proof for me that he is unfit to lead, and that a Labour Party under his stewardship cannot be a safe place for British Jews.

Hardly an exaggeration, bearing in mind she was targeted by a Corbynista anti-Semite at, of all places, at event convened to promote Labour's opposition to anti-Semitism. Days before the September 2016 Labour Conference, Ruth Smeeth revealed that she had received 25,000 abusive online messages, including death threats. Many were of a blatantly anti-Semitic nature. One accused her of being a 'CIA/MI5/Mossad informant', and three others, 'a Yid cunt', a 'fucking traitor' and a 'dyke'. Abuse on this scale and consistency could only have been planned and co-ordinated, and understandably, Smeeth decided it was necessary for her own safety to attend the Labour Party conference accompanied by a bodyguard. A kinder politics! (It was this that led me to end my 40 years membership of the Labour Party. See Appendix N)

Also on the eve of the conference, more evidence accumulated that Momentum had no intention of reining in their attacks on the party's Jews. A campaign video released on Corbyn's official social media website featured topics that his supporters said they were tired of hearing about. One of those featured was anti-Semitism. The Campaign Against Anti-Semitism (CAA) responded by sending a letter of complaint to Party Deputy Leader Tom Watson, accusing Corbyn of 'committing acts that are grossly detrimental to the party' by 'characterising Jewish people as dishonest and dissembling in their reporting of anti-Semitism'. Its letter described how 'Corbyn's personal Facebook and Twitter accounts released a video featuring supporters declaring they were "tired of hearing" about anti-Semitism, characterising the Jewish community's complaints as "rubbish", physically and metaphorically to be tossed to the floor.' Before being withdrawn, the video had attracted 200,000 endorsements. At the same time, police were reported to have interviewed the author of a 1,000-word description of how he would murder Ruth Smeeth. Initially thought to be the work of a Neo-Nazi, in the event, the author proved to be a Labour Party Corbynista. At the conference itself, more evidence emerged that Smeeth's concerns for her safety were well-founded. A leaflet, wholly Nazi in tone and content, was distributed to delegates demanding the dis-affiliation from the Labour party of the Jewish Labour Movement on the grounds that it was involved in a Zionist conspiracy against Corbyn, and being Jewish, was 'a representative of a foreign power'. (Back in May 1984, together with among other anti-Zionists Ken Livingstone, Corbyn had launched a campaign to secure the expulsion of the Jewish Labour Movement from the Labour Party and, for good measure, for the TUC to sever all its fraternal links with the Israeli trade union movement, *Histadrut*. No support from these two was forthcoming for a campaign I was personally involved in at the same time for the TUC to sever its 'fraternal' links with state-run company unions of the Soviet bloc and the Labour Party with Soviet-bloc communist parties.)

No such considerations of national loyalty applied to those Labour Party Muslims who openly proclaimed their support for movements that waged a war of terror against this 'foreign power'. The demand to expel the Jewish Labour Movement from the Labour Party was identical in its anti-Semitic motivation to the eviction, with the connivance of security officials, of Jewish trade unionists

from the TUC's 2015 Tolpuddle Martyrs commemoration event in Devon by a gang of Pro-Palestinian thugs. Very much in the same spirit, at the 2016 Labour Party conference, an Israeli journalist reporting a Momentum fringe meeting had his credentials revoked little more than an hour after receiving them, with the transparently spurious excuse there were no more available. How then, did he get them in the first place? Someone not fully up to speed with Corbyn's version of zero tolerance of anti-Semitism had obviously blundered, because Conference had not done with its abuse of the Jewish Labour Movement. When its Chairman Mike Katz addressed the penultimate session, he was barracked and heckled for saying the lack of Jewish support for Labour made him 'weep' and that the report on anti-Semitism had failed to address the problem properly. Delegates shouted 'rubbish' and 'you don't speak for all Jews'.

On the final day of the conference, the story broke that at a Labour Party so called 'training event' for combatting anti-Semitism, Momentum Vice-Chairman Jackie Walker, who earlier in the year had been briefly suspended for such choice comments as 'the Jews were the chief financiers of the sugar and slave trade' and 'the Jewish Holocaust does not allow Zionists to do what they want', in the same spirit had endorsed a proposal first made by Corbyn in 2011 to in effect 'de-Zionise' Holocaust Memorial Day by renaming it 'Genocide Memorial Day'. It would be 'wonderful [sic!]' said Walker, if Holocaust Day was 'open to all people who experienced Holocaust', starting, we can be sure, with the Palestinians. At the same 'training session', Walker had made comments about the Jews so extreme that they led to a second suspension. Among messages posted in her defence, one read: 'This was no training event. It was an Israeli-sponsored honey trap' and another: 'If Jackie Walker is sacked, I am done with Momentum. I will not betray the victims of Zionism.' Another read: 'Right wing smear tactics from Zionists and the right wing of the Labour Party. Jackie said NOTHING that can be construed as anti-Semitism...I am a member of Momentum and if the [Momentum] Committee expels Jackie then I can guarantee hundreds will stop paying their subscription.' When the question was put to the Momentum Steering Committee, a resolution to remove her from her post as Momentum Vice-Chairperson, but clearing her of all charges of anti-Semitism, and opposing her expulsion from the Labour Party, was carried by seven votes to three. Even though suspended from the Labour Party, she retained her position as a member of the Steering Committee. After much toing and froing, Walker was finally expelled from the Labour Party in March 2019.

In addition to Momentum, Labour Leader Corbyn's second in command, Shadow Chancellor John McDonnell ran his own far left outfit, the Labour Representation Committee. Here, anti-Zionism shaded over into undisguised anti-Semitism. In 2017, its Chairman, John Cushman, published an article on the Committee's website which alleged that under its pre-Corbyn leadership (the Jewish Ed Miliband was his predecessor) had become a 'pawn of Zionist organisations'. But not only the Labour Party: 'The most senior members of both the main parties and the Liberal Democrats' were 'part of the network of Israeli influence.' If not in so many words, he was saying the UK was ruled by the Jews. As for McDonnell, from the early 2000s, he was featured on his website glorifying Palestinian suicide attacks on Israeli civilians, one quoting the father of a suicide bomber who killed 19 mainly teenaged Jews in a Tel Aviv disco as saying, 'When martyrs blow themselves up, the Jews and the Americans listen'.

After another suicide bombing that ended in the deaths of two Jews in a Jerusalem supermarket, McDonnell praised the attack as a ‘successful heroic operation’ that was ‘an example to every Palestinian woman’. Unlike many on the left, McDonnell did not even pretend to support the ‘two state solution’. ‘Even if the Zionist state was the size of a postage stamp, it would have no right to exist’. McDonnell was no less forthcoming in his accusations of Israeli genocide. ‘What’s going on’, he told a Gaza rally in November 2012, ‘is effectively an attempt at genocide against the Palestinians.’ It should have come no surprise then that sharing as he did McDonnell’s views on the iniquities of Israel, on being elected Labour Leader, Corbyn chose McDonnell as his shadow chancellor of the exchequer, along with another no less fanatical anti-Zionist, Livingstone, as his defence (sic) adviser.

As I have already said, anti-Semitism followed Corbyn and his inner circle around like a bad smell. But what else should have expected after their spending most of their political careers in a sewer? Under his leadership, Momentum continued issuing blank cheques for Jew-baiting as if the Chakrabarti report had never happened. Setting an example in this respect, on the following Sunday after the release of the toothless report, and safe in the knowledge that his party’s proposed rules on anti-Semitism would him allow to continue as before to associate with his anti-Semitic terrorist friends from Hamas and Hezbollah, Corbyn was due back in his natural element at the annual anti-Israel ‘al-Quds Day’ march sponsored by his Iranian pimps, which as in previous years, ended with a rally outside the Embassy of the Great Satan in London’s Grosvenor Square. On campuses around the UK, the Sharia left enforced a policy of ‘no platforms’ for ex-Muslim feminists, free-speech campaigners and supporters of Israel, but as the report’s guidelines recommended, the Labour Party’s leader sharing a platform with known anti-Semites was quite in order. The event’s organisers, the Corbyn-admired and comically-named ‘Iranian Human Rights Commission’, announced that as on previous occasions, the UK’s highest profile anti-Zionist, would be ‘leading the march’. However, already in deep enough water for his anti-Semitic associations, he, or more likely his minders, decided that this time, a low profile was the more prudent option. Low profile was not the order the day however for Corbyn’s Hezbollah friends who as they marched, held aloft their movement’s flag, the displaying of which possibly violated section three of the Terrorist Act of 2000. Asked to comment on the flaunting on the streets of London of the emblem of an anti-Semitic, terrorist movement dedicated to the destruction of Israel, London Mayor Sadiq Khan said that he understood ‘the concerns of the Jewish community and the distress these flags cause many Londoners’, but the matter was in the hands of the police.

As always, the Quds Day proceedings home and abroad were accompanied by messages of encouragement from Iran’s clergy, with one from Hossein Salami announcing that there were ‘100,000 missiles’ in Lebanon alone, and thousands more around the Islamic world, all ready to ‘strike at the heart of the Zionist regime, awaiting the command, so that when the trigger is pulled, the accursed black dot will be wiped off the geopolitical map of the world once and for all.’ Thus the religion of peace. Though the military wing of Hezbollah was banned in the UK as a terrorist organisation, its so-called ‘political wing’, under whose auspices the Quds Day rally was officially conducted, was not. In reply to claims that the distinction between the military (that is to say terrorist) and political

wings of the move was fictitious, since they shared the same flag, the Home Office replied ‘the context and manner in which the flag is displayed must demonstrate that it is specifically in support of the proscribed elements of the group.’ So had Corbyn taken his usual place on the speaker’s rostrum festooned by Hezbollah flags, legally all would have been well. Finally, in February 2019, despite Corbynista Labour protests, a blanket ban was imposed on ‘The Party of God’.

On June 4 2016, the day after the Quds Day rally, Corbyn found himself being questioned, all too gently, by his old friend and fellow Islamophile of many years standing, anti-Rushdie campaigner Labour MP Keith Vaz, in his capacity as Chairman the House of Commons Select Committee on Home Affairs. The subject was Labour Party anti-Semitism. His lamentable and at time, distinctly shifty performance, consisting of little more than a succession of diversions, evasions and lies, can be viewed on line, so I leave it to the reader to draw their own conclusions as to whether such a person was fit to hold any public office, let alone that of a leader of a party or, Allah forbid, Prime Minister. At the outset of the proceedings, after being pressed on the matter, Corbyn reluctantly finally conceded that the Labour Party’s own inquiry had not been independent since it had been conducted by someone who herself was a Labour Party member. (Having joined when she was given the task, she was on its completion elevated to the House of Lords for what many saw a reward for producing an anodyne report that essentially allowed anti-Semitic party members to continue as before.) A number of exchanges captured perfectly just how seriously Corbyn took the issue of anti-Semitism within his own party. Setting the tone for the entire proceedings, at the very outset, he claimed, contrary to other accounts that had put the number nearer to 80, that fewer than twenty members had been suspended (only suspended) after allegations of anti-Semitic conduct of one kind or another, implying, as he and his supporters had done on previous occasions, that the whole affair was a storm in a tea cup. Subsequent revelations as to its actual scale, and not least his own track record on the ‘Jewish question’, would give the lie to that claim.

Asked by Vaz what should be done with party members who use words like Hitler and ‘Zio’ to insult Jews, Corbyn replies, ‘what will happen is they will be told they should not use them’, this being the approach recommended by the party’s powder-puff Chakrabarti report. So, a party member calls a Jew a Nazi, and is told not to say it again. And that would be that. Vaz, obviously dissatisfied by Corbyn’s laid-back approach, told him that Committee members were concerned that the report described such manifestations of anti-Semitism as merely ‘unhappy [sic] incidents’. Corbyn disagreed, defending the report as ‘a bold step that we should be commended for’, so bold indeed that it recommended that members guilty of anti-Semitic conduct should not be necessarily expelled or even suspended, and that it was quite in order for members to appear on the same platform, as Corbyn did regularly, with anti-Semites. Questioned as to why a report devoted to the problem of anti-Semitism within the Labour Party offered no definition of anti-Semitism, Corbyn gave this substitute for an answer: ‘I thought it would be very obvious what anti-Semitism is.’ But if the offence is never defined, how can anyone be found guilty of it? And we know that within Corbyn’s immediate circle there was at least one prominent anti-Zionist who had so defined anti-Semitism, at least to his own satisfaction, as to be able to claim that not once

in his more than forty years in the Labour Party had he ever encountered it, and that moreover, anti-Semitism was ‘not exactly the same thing as racism’. If so, why the inquiry?

Then there was the question of Israel, and Corbyn’s decades of close involvement with campaigns, movements and individuals who, to put not too fine a point on it, did not wish Israel and its Jewish population well. Asked if he thought the state of Israel had a right to exist, Corbyn, seemingly caught off his guard, replies, ‘Sorry?’ Asked again, he replies with a blatantly evasive *non-sequitur*: ‘Yes, the state of Israel exists, of course’. Yes, indeed it does, despite all the bloody endeavours of Comrade Corbyn’s Jihadi ‘friends’. But that was not the question, so Vaz tries for a third time. ‘Yes, of course, our party’s policy is for a two-state solution’. And so it is, though it most certainly is not that of his ‘friends’ Hamas and Hezbollah. But was it Corbyn’s? This surely was the nub of the issue. But Vaz chose not to pursue it, perhaps because he already knew the answer, and wanted to save his friend from the dilemma of either of answering it truthfully or telling yet another lie that might put in him bad standing with his jihadi ‘friends’. I provide in this work irrefutable evidence of what Corbyn’s truthful answer to that question would have been, had Vaz asked it.

Instead, Vaz moved on to the anti-Zionist company Corbyn had kept over the years, highlighted by the meeting he hosted in Parliament in March 2009 for representatives of Hezbollah, of whom he said, together with Hamas, it was a ‘pleasure and an honour’ to call his ‘friends’. When pressed by Vaz to say whether they were still his friends, Corbyn replied that he had used ‘inclusive language’ to further a ‘peace process’, but that they were not his friends now, and ‘never were’. Readers are of course free to believe him if they wish. Either he was lying then, or lying to the Select Committee. As for a ‘peace process’ (something he had also recommended be pursued with the Islamic State) even the gullible Corbyn, for all his ‘inclusive language’ during his dealings with his friends in both Hamas and Hezbollah, must have realised that the two terrorist movements were seeking, not a negotiated peace with Israel, but its destruction, along with the murder of its entire Jewish population, because all he had to do to be aware of this was to read their founding charters, and the declarations of their leaders. Corbyn’s claim that his involvement with anti-Semitic, genocidal terrorists was purely in the interests of a ‘peace process’ not only non-existent but impossible was, however, not challenged by Vaz. Neither was Corbyn asked to give evidence of the tangible results, if any, of his peace-making efforts, probably because Vaz knew they amounted to zero.

Perhaps the most extraordinary and damning exchanges occurred in relation to Corbyn’s dealings with two notorious anti-Semites. The first was Sultan Raed Salah, the Hamas preacher who claimed that no Jews went to work in the World Trade Centre on 9/11, and that Jews use murdered children’s blood to mix with their Passover unleaven bread. The second slander had been the cause of his conviction in an Israeli court. His notorious anti-Semitism also led in 2011 to an attempt by the Home Office to have him deported from the UK when Corbyn invited him to attend an anti-Zionist rally in Leicester and a meeting the next day of the Palestine Solidarity Campaign hosted by Corbyn at Westminster, where he described Hamas and Hezbollah as his ‘friends’. Salah appeared at the Leicester event, but was arrested in London before the second. He was electronically tagged and, pending the outcome of his appeal against deportation, placed under house

arrest where, Corbyn related to the Select Committee, he visited him, even though Corbyn must have been fully aware on what grounds Salah's freedom of movement was being restricted. After a lengthy legal process, an immigration tribunal found that although Salah was, as the Home Office originally claimed, an anti-Semite, his right to free speech entitled him not to be deported. (I agree with this decision. It is a scandal however that Home Office had also denied entry into the UK of a US scholar and a Dutch MP, not for telling lies about the Jews, but the truth about Islam.) The fact that Salah was an avowed anti-Semite of the most extreme kind did not seem to have troubled Corbyn in the least, engaged as the Sheikh undoubtedly was in the noble fight to eliminate the state of Israel. Had not Corbyn praised Salah as an 'honoured citizen' with 'a voice that must be heard', and looked forward to the day that he could take tea with him on the House of Commons terrace? Vaz reminded Corbyn that he had shared a platform with Salah, 'who was found guilty by a British Judge of using the Blood Libel, the lie that Jews use Christians for rituals. You invited him for tea in the terrace of the House of Commons.' Corbyn saw nothing wrong with this, calmly replying: 'He didn't come', as if that resolved the matter of his involvement with a notorious anti-Semite. Vaz repeats, 'but you invited him'. Corbyn then explains why he couldn't make it:

He was under house arrest. I met him to discuss the terms of his house arrest. He is an Israeli national and I was quite surprised if he was seen to be such a dangerous figure in Israel that he was allowed to travel. He travelled to this country and I did meet him while he was under house arrest and I had a very long discussion with him about how to bring about an eventual peace process in the Middle East and his concerns about the Palestinian people living within the borders of the state of Israel, and I said to him that I condemned any form of racism.

Let us see exactly what Salah had to say in a notorious speech made in Jerusalem in 2007 about the so-called 'blood libel', and then ask ourselves, how can anyone who wishes well of the Palestinian cause actively bring discredit on that cause not only by associating with someone who promotes such vile slanders against the Jews, but acts as their public champion?

We have never allowed ourselves to knead the bread for the breaking of the fast during the blessed month of Ramadan with the blood of the children. And if someone wants a wider explanation you should ask what used to happen to some of the children of Europe, whose blood was mixed in the dough of the holy breads. God almighty, is this religion? God will confront you for what you are [sic] doing.

Vaz, palpably perplexed and embarrassed that his friend of many years did not seem in the least perturbed by Salah's particularly virulent anti-Semitism, asked if he would still invite him to tea on the House of Commons terrace. Corbyn replied, 'no, I don't think so' and added, sadly, 'but he is not coming back anyway'. He was then pressed on his no less amicable relations with the Reverend Stephen Sizer, who shared both Sultan Salah's belief that the Jews were responsible for 9/11 and a platform with Corbyn at the 2012 annual Iran-sponsored Quds Day march in London. Vaz put it to him: 'You wrote to defend a friend, Stephen Sizer, a vicar disciplined by the Church of England for anti-Semitism, saying he was under attack by a pro-Israeli smear campaign. Do you regret those comments?'

Corbyn again evaded the question, opting instead as he did with Salah to sing, somewhat incoherently, the praises of yet another anti-Semitic brother-in-arms in the anti-Zionist movement: ‘I’ve met Stephen Sizer on many occasions in his role as a vicar [?] and as somebody that does support Palestinian people, who feels with much justification that their human rights are under attack. There are people living in the Palestinian territories, and I was very surprised when that [sic] was done to him’. The inference that could easily be drawn from Corbyn’s defence of Sizer was that he had been disciplined for supporting the Palestinians, and not his views about 9/11 and the Jews. Even so, Corbyn believed that Sizer’s claims about 9/11, which implied there had been a Jewish conspiracy to defame Islam, did not constitute anti-Semitism, and consequently, did not deserve the reprimand he received from his church (As for himself, he had said on another occasion that 9/11 had been, quote, ‘manipulated’.) So Vaz tried again: ‘Do you still support what he does, support what he says?’ Again, Corbyn evaded the question: ‘I supported what he was doing in supporting the Palestinian people. The things [sic] that emerged later I was unaware of at the time.’ So why then write a letter in Sizer’s defence claiming that he had been victimised because he had ‘dared to speak out against Zionism’?

When challenged, as he was on this occasion, to justify his many and long-standing associations with notorious anti-Semites, Corbyn’s defence had always been that irrespective of their opinions of the Jews, which of course he did not share, his reason for collaborating with such people had been their mutual concern for the cause of the Palestinians. Puerile though it was, one could at least take this excuse seriously if Corbyn’s concern for the Palestinians had been extended to the nearly 3,500 Palestinians who had been killed in Syria between 2011 and mid 2016 as a direct consequence of the civil wars being waged in that country. But since they were not victims of a Zionist ‘genocide’, their deaths passed unprotested by Palestinian leaders, the Sharia left and Corbyn himself. Not only was there silence. In 2011, Corbyn was a guest of the very regime responsible for many of those deaths.

These and other similar exchanges established beyond any doubt that Corbyn was prepared to ignore or deny the existence of the most extreme manifestations of anti-Semitism in those he chose to collaborate with so long as the shared goal was opposition to the policies and, as I firmly believe, existence of the state of Israel. The very next day after the hearing, just what Corbyn’s ‘bold step’ in combating anti-Semitism amounted to became clear when Naz Shah, the suspended Muslim MP for Bradford West, who not only tweeted that the Jews of Israel should be ‘relocated’ to the USA, but also, in another tweet that had been consistently ignored in her case, that ‘never forget that everything that Hitler did in Germany was legal’, after a *pro forma* apology that could not possibly have been sincere, was re-instated to full membership. It was a decision that must have left many non-Corbynite Labour Party members wondering, if advocating the Nazi-style deportation of six million Jews and claiming that Hitler committed no crimes are not sufficient grounds for expulsion, what is? Could it be mere chance that until her suspension Shah was an ‘adviser’ to Corbyn’s second-in-command and some say, *eminence grise*, the no less obsessively anti-Zionist Shadow Chancellor John McDonnell?

On June 16, 2016, Shadow Foreign Secretary Hilary Benn was sacked by Corbyn after making a number of statements in the Commons on Syria and the

Islamic State that were diametrically opposed to the policies of his Leader. Benn's dismissal was followed by the resignation of 63 of Corbyn's shadow front bench team, together with a joint statement by all 20 Labour Euro MPs demanding his resignation. The day before, a no-confidence vote of MPs had been carried by 172 to 40, leaving Corbyn with insufficient loyalist candidates to fill all the shadow vacancies. This inevitable, long anticipated and historically unprecedented revolt had initially been signalled on December 2, 2015, when in a speech in the Commons, Labour's decidedly non-Sharia Shadow Foreign Secretary Hilary Benn defied and outraged his leader by supporting a UN resolution and Parliamentary motion authorising the bombing of the Islamic State, and compounded his sin by listing some of its worst atrocities and describing its regime as fascist. So it was not unexpected when within hours of the EU referendum result, which many in the party blamed on Corbyn's at best, lukewarm commitment to a remain vote, Benn finally raised the standard of revolt and was then promptly sacked by Corbyn.

Just for once, though not by design, Diane Abbott's opaque pronouncement that 'if there is any politician who stands for not-politics-as-usual it's Jeremy Corbyn'. was spot on. No previous Labour Leader had ever been accused of failing to deal with anti-Semitism in his party, let alone been accused of it himself, or associating with representatives of movements whose declared goal were the elimination of an entire country and the extermination of 80% of its population. By now, even the *Guardian* had reluctantly admitted, prematurely, as it turned out, that 'the Corbyn experiment [sic] is effectively over at Westminster'. But deep in his bunker, with the rumble of the rebels' tanks and guns growing ever louder, deserted even by some of his most faithful supporters, yet convinced of the rightness of his cause, Corbyn fought on. He promoted untested new officers (some whom in their turn deserted him) disposed of imaginary forces and talked of victory, victory over the traitors within, and the enemies without.

As the pressure built up on Corbyn to step down, stories found their way into the media that the strain was beginning to tell. If the front man caved in, all would be lost. At all costs, the show had to be kept on the road. So while projecting to the party and public at large an image of a powerful leader and creative thinker called upon and eminently qualified to set his country on a new path, every effort was made to insulate him from hostile or even friendly advice. To keep the media at bay, in public he was always surrounded by a team of 'minders' headed by the silver spoon Winchester and Oxford duo of Milne and Schneider. Labour MPs were denied access to him, even including the party's Deputy Leader Tom Watson, because he might 'jab his finger at him'. In terms that replicated the 'safe spacism' and 'no platformism' of the campus Thought Police (whence hailed many of the cadres of Momentum), a request for an audience with the Dear Leader was rejected on the grounds that Corbyn was 'a seventy-year-old man' to whom his minders had 'a duty of care'. A duty of care to protect him from a private conversation with his own party's Deputy Leader? To he who would be *Prime Minister*? A duty of care for someone who according to his minders, needed to be protected from having a finger pointed at him, and yet was praised by trade union official Len McClusky of UNITE, as 'a man of steel'? (Could this have been a Freudian slip? This translates into the language of Putin as 'Stalin').

As if aware of his fragility, even rebel front bench MP's carefully chose their words in their resignation letters, balancing criticism of his glaring inadequacies

with what in many cases seemed an agreed *pro forma* listing of Corbyn's supposedly positive qualities... 'kind and genuinely decent', 'a man of principle'. This is of course standard procedure for someone whose incompetence requires that he be 'let go'. Yet given that his extra-Parliamentary causes and associations were known to all concerned, and had been a subject of much public debate and concern from the outset of his leadership bid, it was strange to find not a single MP as much as alluding to them, even though they rendered him far less fit to hold any office in the Labour Party than his chronically meagre political and intellectual capacities. How could one be 'kind' and 'genuinely decent' and at the same have as their 'friends' and political associates those who seek the extermination of the Jews and recycle the vilest anti-Semitic myths? It had been said in Corbyn's defence, both by himself and his supporters, that he cultivated these friendships and associations in order firstly to enable others to hear what they had to say, and secondly, to persuade them to seek other means than violence to obtaining their ends. Persuading is one thing, regularly sharing platforms and never dissenting in public with those whom you have failed to persuade is another, which is what Corbyn had been doing for two decades and more. Could he, in his defence, perhaps have pointed to any area of policy where his friends in Hamas and Hezbollah had, to the smallest degree, deviated in word or deed from their declared aim of destroying the state of Israel by armed struggle? He was able to provide neither, even though it was obviously in their interests to let their useful idiot believe that one day, such a shift might occur, because that is that is exactly what another gullible fool was led to believe in his dealings with another genocidal anti-Semite, Hitler.

After decades in the far-left political wilderness, but now with their noses in the Labour Party trough, when the tide threatened to turn against them, those who pulled the strings of the Corbynista project showed no signs of going quietly. But there is no doubt that they had been caught off balance by the onset of a crisis that over the next three years, would see Corbyn summoned to appear before a House of Common Select Committee hearing on his handling of his party's anti-Semitism, followed by three Parliamentary debates and investigations by the Metropolitan Police, the Equality and Human Rights Commission and BBC Panorama into the same subject, and mass resignations from the party up to the highest levels. All this lay in the future when super-loyalist Diane Abbott, shadow minister for International Development and later Shadow Home Secretary, took the bullet for Corbyn. Notorious for her racist comment about nurses from Finland with blue eyes and blond hair taking jobs in the UK's NHS, she refused in an interview on BBC TV to condemn as anti-Semitic a no less notorious cartoon that appeared in Livingstone's Gaddafi-financed *Labour Herald* depicting an Israeli Jew in a Nazi uniform giving the Hitler salute and captioned 'The Final Solution'. Her response was to ignore the cartoon and instead claim that 'it is a smear to say that the Labour Party has a problem with anti-Semitism'. And her leader was no less relaxed, insisting that there was 'not a problem' with anti-Semitism, and that talk of a crisis 'comes from those who are nervous of the strength of the party at local level'.

No less sanguine was Len McCluskey, General Secretary of UNITE trade union, who predicted that 'once the mood music [sic!] of anti-Semitism dies down then next week there'll be another subject'. Yes, indeed...the fallout from the EU referendum. However, another official of the same union, the Corbynite Martin

Meyer, who also sat on the Labour Party's National Executive Committee, begged to differ. The crisis was real enough, and had been instigated by...yes, of course, just as Livingstone claimed, the Jews. In an email titled 'How Israel manufactured UK Labour Party's anti-Semitism crisis', Meyer claimed that the whole affair had been the work of the 'Blairite right wing' in cahoots with a 'Zionist lobby'.

There was a time when one could have been certain that some of the views of the Muslims and Sharia leftists extensively quoted above and elsewhere in this work could only have been those of avowed Nazis, a time when advertising such bigotry would have not only have been regarded as incompatible with membership of the Labour Party, but of any party other than one of the extreme right. Under the new Sharia dispensation of Ayatollah Corbyn, this was no longer the case. Hatred of the Jews, always the common coin of the far right, had now become also the lowest common denominator of the far left, where it found shared ground with large swathes of the UK's Muslim diaspora, increasing numbers of whom were acquiring positions of influence both in the constituencies and as elected representatives in local and central government. Do not take my word for the truth of this allegation. A (liberal) Muslim himself, this is what Mehdi Hasan wrote in the *New Statesman* on March 23, 2013, in an article entitled, *The sorry truth is that the virus of anti-Semitism has infected the British Muslim Community:*

It pains me to say this, but anti-Semitism isn't just tolerated in some sections of the British Muslim community, it's routine and commonplace...it's our dirty little secret...I can't keep count of the number of Muslims I have come across from close relatives and friends to perfect strangers for whom wired and wacky anti-Semitic conspiracy theories are the default explanation for a range of national and international events.

As for the Holocaust, his fellow Muslims replied, 'don't be silly. Never happened'. And in a survey published in December 2016 of more than 3,000 UK Muslims, only 4% of those interviewed believed that Al Qaeda was responsible for 9/11. Bear in mind these would have been the opinions in many cases of educated Muslims, some the so-called 'pillars' and 'role models' of a 'community' that the multi-culturalists enthused about and politicians never tired of praising for its immense and varied contributions to British society, a community which on the commendably honest testimony of one of its members, seethed with hatred against the Jews and lived in a make-believe world of collective denial where Muslims were always the victims of infidel, usually Jewish conspiracies. A survey of UK Muslim attitudes released in April 2016 and featured on Channel Four TV confirmed the personal testimony of Mehdi Hassan. More than a quarter of UK Muslims questioned believed that Jews caused most wars, compared with 6% for the UK as whole. No less than 40% believed that the Jews, who comprise 0.2% of the world's population compared to 22% for Muslims, exert 'too much control over world affairs', compared to 10% of the whole UK population, clear evidence, if the belief were true, of a world Jewish conspiracy. A third of UK Muslims thought the Jews had too much power and exploit the Holocaust (insofar as it happened) to their own advantage, compared to 6% for the UK as a whole. In each of these cases, it is obvious that a sizable proportion of the UK percentages

holding these opinions was comprised of Muslims, even though they accounted for less than five percent of the total UK population.

Unfortunately, the opportunity was missed to ask whether, like the Muslim Labour Councillor in Luton, they approved of the Holocaust, or like so many of their co-religionists in the Middle East, believed it never happened. It was this ‘dirty little secret’, only now no longer either little or secret, and as filthy as it could get, that was been embraced and recast after its own fashion by the Sharia left as the price for its collaboration with the leaders of this ‘Muslim community’ in their joint campaign of hate against Israel and all things Jewish. Encouraged and protected by the Corbynite ascendancy, this anti-Semitic cancer had eaten its way into the very fibre of the Labour movement, and it would need brave as well as decent and honest men and women to resist and defeat it.

At a 2016 May Day rally in Trafalgar Square, from a rostrum fronted by a huge hammer and sickle banner and a giant portrait of Stalin, Corbyn repeated yet again the false claim that ‘we stand absolutely against anti-Semitism in any form’ The next day, the story broke that on his own website, Corbyn, the ‘friend’ of Jew-killing Jihadis, and associate of Holocaust deniers and Jewish conspiracy theorists, had praised as ‘an icon’, to be compared with Nelson Mandela no less, a Fatah terrorist, Marwan Barghouti, convicted by an Israeli court in 2004 of plotting the murder of Jewish civilians. This was followed by the revelation that Hamas had sent a message of solidarity to their embattled champion and subsequently, a cheque for £10,000 towards Corbyn’s campaign for his re-election as Labour Leader. Their message made it very clear that like its UK supporters, Hamas did not regard waging war on the Jews of Israel as terrorism, any more than it considered Labour Party members’ praise of Hitler, belief in a world Jewish conspiracy and demands for the deportation of all Israel’s Jews as proof of anti-Semitism:

We see his [Corbyn’s] engagement as a very important statement that is also a very hit [sic] that the Zionist enemy received. Hamas is not and will not be considered a terrorist group and our struggle is reduced [i.e., confined] to the borders of occupied Palestine [that, is Israel] This is a Zionist campaign to define Labour Party leaders as anti-Semitic, a desperate move that reflects the weakness and confusion of the Zionist entity.

This, coming from a movement that endorsed the *Protocols* and claimed to have uncovered a world Zionist conspiracy going as far back as the French Revolution. As Mehdi Hassan said, some Muslims really did have a problem when it came to the Jews. For this very reason, given Labour’s growing dependency on the Muslim vote (26 seats had 20% or more Muslims), and their increasing influence in the party at every level, it would have been be naïve to assume the Muslim source of Labour Party anti-Semitism would have been addressed as it should have. Why else the insertion of ‘Islamophobia’ into the Chakrabarti inquiry when its sole focus was supposed anti-Semitism, if not to depict Muslims as the victims of racial and religious prejudice in the Labour Party instead of acknowledging they were among its most prominent and extreme perpetrators? Appearing before the House of Commons Home Affairs Select Committee’s inquiry into Labour anti-Semitism (not to be confused with the Labour Party’s parallel and strictly in-house investigation) Jonathen Arkush,

President of the Jewish Board of Deputies got to the heart of the matter when he traced the origins of the surge of anti-Semitism within the Labour Party to the election of Corbyn as its leader:

The election of a leader who is closely associated with the Palestine Solidarity Campaign [in a statement on the campaign's website congratulating Corbyn on his election as Labour leader, he is described as a 'long-time patron of the PSC], with Stop the War, [of which Corbyn was the chairman until elected Labour Leader] with a very hostile position on Israel, very well-known and very well publicised, and someone who has thought it appropriate to meet here in the democratic mother of parliaments with terrorist organisations whose stated mission in life is to kill as many Jews and Christians as possible [presumably an allusion to Article 7 of the Hamas Charter] has clearly sent the wrong kind of message to some people. With the advent of a more leftward tilt in the leadership of the Labour Party, some people think a space has been opened up for them, or they feel emboldened to say things which previously they felt they could not say in polite society ...the impression is being given by the leader of the Labour Party of a certain reluctance to accept these issues.

Arkush told the Committee that he had asked Corbyn to agree that on reflection, his meetings with Hamas and Hezbollah had been 'inappropriate' but that he had refused to do so. To invite their leaders to address meetings in Parliament, to promote their genocidal cause in public rallies, to call these anti-Semites and genocidists one's 'friends'...none of this did the Leader of the Labour Party consider 'inappropriate'. It would also have been pertinent to ask Corbyn why, when choosing to associate with and promote movements in the Middle East that claimed to represent the Palestinian cause, he had selected two that were not only avowedly dedicated to the destruction of Israel but the murder of its entire Jewish population, and not Fatah, the PLO, and the Palestinian Authority, which even if only on paper, recognised the state of Israel and were, again, if only on paper, committed to a two-state solution to the Palestine question. A perverse preference, some might say, for someone who was always advertising his devotion to the cause of world peace.

And not just for Corbyn. Only a matter of days after Chakraborty's elevation to the House of Lords in return for services rendered, more revelations surfaced concerning her patron's anti-Semitic connections. In 2014, Labour MP Grahame Morris, Corbyn's Shadow Communities Spokesman and, not by chance, also Chairman of the Labour Friends of Palestine, demanded of the then Prime Minister David Cameron that British Jews who had served in the Israeli Defence Force should be treated as terrorists. He had also posted on-line a picture of an Israeli flag with the caption: 'Nazi in my Village: do you see the flag fly?' Following the example set by his leader, Morris hosted events featuring anti-Semitic Muslims. One such gathering was chaired by the UK-based Palestinian journalist Sameh Habeeb who, with a fine sense of timing, chose Holocaust Memorial Day to publish an article in his *Palestinian Telegraph* denying the Holocaust ever occurred. Habeeb was also the originator of the accusation, subsequently recycled by PSC Patron and Liberal Democrat Peeress Baroness Tonge, that while carrying out relief work after the Haiti earthquake of 2010, Israel soldiers harvested the organs of its victims. The story also broke on the same day, August 8, 2016, of Corbyn's involvement with yet another anti-Semite,

the academic and *Guardian* columnist Sama Ramadani, whom the Labour leader once described as a ‘fascinating [sic] great friend.’ Ramadan had offered a simple and all-too-familiar explanation for his friend’s troubles. His academic training led him to the only possible explanation...the Jews. Accusations of anti-Semitism could only have one source, ‘backers of Israel’ who were seeking to ‘undermine Jeremy’s support for Palestine’. As for the 172 MPs who voted no confidence in his friend’s leadership, they too were ‘Zionist mouthpieces’. Corbyn’s office declined to comment on these revelations, a sure indication that under his leadership the Labour Party would continue to be a Safe Space for anti-Semites.

While not saying so in so many words, the final report of the House of Commons Home Affairs Select Committee investigation into the rise of anti-Semitism within the Labour Party under Corbyn’s leadership came to pretty much the same conclusion. Corbyn personally was accused of a ‘lack of leadership’ on the issue, rendering the Labour Party ‘a safe space’ [sic] for those with ‘vile attitudes’ towards Jews. The failure of his leadership to ‘consistently and effectively deal with anti-Semitic incidents in recent years’ had left the party open to the charge that ‘elements of the Labour movement are institutionally anti-Semitic’. Like many other of its critics, the Select Committee was far from satisfied with the report of the Chakraborty inquiry commissioned (reluctantly) and then praised by Corbyn. One Committee member said it was ‘not worth the paper it was written on’. (However, it did earn a peerage for its author) The report had failed to deliver ‘a comprehensive set of recommendations, to provide a definition of anti-Semitism [not, I suspect, an accidental omission], or to suggest ways of dealing with anti-Semitism’. As for Corbyn himself, the Committee found that his failure to deal appropriately with the issue showed that he did not fully appreciate ‘the distinct nature of post-war anti-Semitism’...in other words, its assuming the guise of anti-Zionism, which as we have seen, had been one of, if not the most, of Corbyn’s main preoccupations in his time as an MP.

I have a proposal, made in all seriousness, that will, if strictly enforced, go at least some way to towards combatting and identifying the sources of anti-Semitism within the Labour Party, and certainly further than the whitewash of a report cooked up by its official party enquiry. It follows the excellent example set by the US imperialist occupying forces at the end of the Second World War, when they compelled German civilians living close to Nazi concentration camps to witness at first hand the corpses and skeletal survivors of the victims of the crimes their beloved leader had committed in their names. The US forces also obliged civilians to watch the screening of films specially made by the US army of the horrors revealed by the liberation of Nazi death camps. To make sure the message got home, civilians were conscripted by the US army to bury the tens of thousands of corpses of prisoners starved and worked to death by their tormentors, not nearly enough of whom were either beaten to death by their former captives, or shot on the spot by outraged US GIs.

Following, though of course not in every detail, the excellent example set by the US imperialists in post-Nazi Germany, what I propose is the following: The archive of film material on the Holocaust is now so comprehensive that compiling a representative documentary, say of some two hours’ duration, on the practical consequences of anti-Semitism should present no technical difficulties. I suggest that it begins with that part of Hitler’s speech to the Reichstag on January 30, 1939, in which he announced to the world the fate he had in store for the Jews,

and concludes with footage of the various Nazi death camps that were the scene of the Final Solution. All existing Labour Party members would be required to attend a screening of such a production, at a suitable venue to be chosen by each local Constituency Party. There can be as many showings as are necessary to ensure that all members have the opportunity to attend. New members would likewise be required to attend such viewings. Any member who refused or failed to attend such a screening would be automatically and instantly expelled from the party for life, with no right of appeal. Once the screening programme has been completed, any expressions of hostility towards the Jews, for example comparing them with Nazis and accusing them of genocide, calls for the destruction of the state of Israel, denies the Holocaust and the right of Israel to exist (as distinct from criticism of its policies), and involvement in any activities with organisations or individuals which likewise deny the Holocaust and Israel's right to exist, promote conspiracy theories about the Jews or have the destruction of Israel and the killing of Jews as their objectives (such as Hamas and Hezbollah), would also be met with immediate expulsion for life with no right of appeal. All members so expelled would have their names published, together with the reason or reasons for their expulsion. If these proposals were to be adopted, they would undoubtedly leave Labour, at least for a while, a smaller party. But it would also be a much cleaner one.

